

PLATE 10: PREDICTION OF BLACK FREQUENCY
RATES AND TO CUMULATIVE AND EQUAL
PROBABILITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

By
ROBERT KIM CALDWELL

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE STUDENTS COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
1970

Copyright by
Elmer Van Sickle
1928

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was made possible through the cooperation, guidance, and assistance of various individuals.

To the members of my committee I am deeply grateful for their guidance, encouragement, and suggestions. In no small measure appreciation must I thank Dr. James L. Walker-Brown, Dr. Layton T. Roberts, Dr. Thomas M. Cole, Dr. John H. Hickman, and Mr. Joseph H. Mandeville for permitting me to benefit from their experience and insight. Specifically, I am indebted to Dr. John H. Hickman for the many hours spent in guiding the research activities and for his guidance.

The cooperation and especially acknowledgement of Mr. Richard F. McMichael, University Bookstore; Mr. Robert M. Finkenberg, Resident University Treasurer, and Mr. Douglas T. Turner, Director of Financial Aid, who made it possible to gather the data for the study.

It is difficult to put into words my heartfelt gratitude to my wife and children who tolerate me and my all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xv
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Review of the Literature	1
Summary	27
II. THE PROBLEM	29
Statement of the Problem	29
The Need for the Study	30
Rationale	30
Definition of Terms	30
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	30
Description of Population	30
Collection of Data	40
Analysis of Data	40
Limitations	40
IV. FINDINGS	43
V. CONCLUSIONS	44
Implications for Further Research	75
APPENDICES	
A. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM	77
B. DESCRIPTION OF THE FLORIDA STATEWIDE TWELFTH GRADE TESTING PROGRAM	79

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

APPENDIXES	Page
C EXPLANATION OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS	32
D RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS FOR TWO OUTCOMES	33
ENDNOTES	33
GRAPHICAL SKETCH	34

UNIT 17: TENSES

	Title	Page
2	Average high school grade-point average and average Florida Board of High School scores of black freshmen admitted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970.	27
3	Number of black freshmen admitted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970, who came from all black or integrated high schools.	28
4	Number and average family income of black freshmen admitted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970.	29
5	Number of black freshmen accepted to the compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970 who came from books or latest books	30
6	Variable means by group and differences in means	31
7	Linear combination of variables resulting when one or more variables are deleted from a combination of variables to discriminate between a group of subjects making unsatisfactory progress and a group of subjects making satisfactory progress at the University of Florida.	32
8	Range, mean, and standard deviation of high school grade-point averages for students making unsatisfactory academic progress (Group III) and students making unsatisfactory academic progress (Group II) at the University of Florida.	43
9	Percentage of black students classified compensatory or regular who were making unsatisfactory progress (Group II) or unsatisfactory progress (Group III)	45

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table	Page
9. Descriptives of students classified as Group 1 or Group 2 who were enrolled in either the dispensation or in regular program	54
10. Matrix of correlation coefficients for seven independent variables and grade-point average earned at the University of Florida by 141 Black students	54
11. Means, standard deviations, regression coefficients, standard errors of regression coefficients, and proportion of variance (coefficient) for seven independent variables correlated with grade-point average earned at the University of Florida by 141 Black students	54
12. Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting as independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and GPA earned by 141 Black students	54
13. Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting as independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and GPA earned by 58 Black students making unsatisfactory progress	54
14. Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting as independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and GPA earned by 83 Black students making satisfactory progress	54
15. Matrix of correlation coefficients for four independent variables and grade-point average earned by 26 Black students in the regular section of Comprehensive Logic	54
16. Matrix of correlation coefficients for four independent variables and grade-point average earned by 35 Black students in the special section of Comprehensive Logic	54

www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/1/pg1.html

Table	Page	
17	Means, standard deviations, regression coefficients, standard error of regression coefficients, and proportion of variance (multiple R-squared) for four independent variables correlated with grades earned in the regular section of Comprehensive Logic by 34 black students	69
18	Means, standard deviations, regression coefficients, standard error of regression coefficients, and proportion of variance (multiple R-squared) for four independent variables correlated with grades earned in the special section of Comprehensive Logic by 55 black students	71
20	Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting when independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and grades received by 34 black students enrolled in the regular section of Comprehensive Logic	43
20	Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting when independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and grades received by 55 black students enrolled in the special section of Comprehensive Logic	43

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF BLACK FRESHMEN
ADMITTED TO CONVENTIONAL AND SPECIAL
PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

By

Edward Van Gilder

December, 1973

Chairman: Dr. James L. Winkenwerper

Cochairman: Dr. John P. Nichols

Major Department: Educational Administration and Supervision

This study examined into the academic performance of 141 black students admitted to the University of Florida in 1970, because they did not meet the admission requirements. 82 of the students had been assigned to the Expanded Educational Opportunities Program (EERP) - a compensatory education program, designed to test whether students whose qualifications fell below the required standards for admission could with special assistance succeed at the University of Florida.

Specifically the study sought the answers to the following questions: (1) Are there significant differences between black freshmen making satisfactory academic progress and black freshmen making unsatisfactory academic progress and, (2) How well have black students, assigned to the compensatory program, performed academically as compared to black students admitted to the regular academic program? Additionally, the study sought to evaluate the usefulness of

the compensatory education program in relation to academic performance.

Independent variables included (1) participation in the compensatory or regular program, (2) high school grade-point average, (3) Florida Building Code Test score, (4) graduation from integrated or non-integrated high school, (5) sex, (6) marital status of parents, and (7) family income. The dependent variable was the overall grade-point average earned at the University of Florida after three quarters. Students with an overall grade-point average of 1.0 or higher were considered to be making satisfactory academic progress. Students with an overall grade-point average of 1.0 or lower were considered to be making unsatisfactory progress.

The statistical treatments employed were a discriminant analysis for two groups using the Remedial Computer Program, RCP81, and a multiple regression analysis using the Standardized Computer Program, SCP81.

No significant differences were found between the two groups of black freshmen. For all practical purposes, the group making satisfactory academic progress and the group making unsatisfactory progress came from the same population. To a limited extent the two groups could be differentiated on the basis of high school grade-point average, an independent variable which was also found to have the strongest relationship to grade-point average earned at the University

of Florida. The findings of the study showed that for this particular group of black students the variables selected had little relationship to academic achievement. The findings also suggested that variables in addition to those selected will need to be investigated to learn more about the academic performance of black students at the University of Florida.

The results of the analyses brought into question (1) the reliance placed on the Florida method used most as a means of selecting black students for either the compensatory or the regular academic program and (2) the usefulness of the compensatory education program. Furthermore, the ranking of students in regard to the actual level of academic achievement attained by the students on the compensatory education program was more difficult by differentiating the grading procedures.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1944, the Educational Policies Committee of the National Education Association declared the time had come for accepting the idea that unequal opportunity also applied to education beyond the high school. With the enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1946, the Congress committed this nation to that goal.

The ideal of equal opportunity for higher education for all Americans, regardless of race or economic circumstances, is clearly gaining acceptance but a century of separate and inferior education for Black Americans has created a significant disparity which has prevented Black students from gaining admission to higher education, especially to colleges and universities with predominantly white students.

To overcome this disparity is a difficult task. Nevertheless, colleges and universities should be committed, morally and morally, to assure that access to higher education is not restricted because of race, color, or ethnic background. Toward the fulfillment of this goal, the Southern Regional Education Board's Commission on Higher Education (1987) committed to the educational leaders in the South

that "immediate steps . . . be taken to help Negro college students overcome the handicaps of educational disadvantage and cultural deprivation" (p. 31).

In 1970, the administration of the University of Florida took a step toward that goal when it admitted 143 black students, 12 of whom did not meet the minimum requirements for admission. These 12 students were enrolled in the Expanded Educational Opportunities Program (EOP)--a compensatory education program designed to help students whose qualifications fell below the required standards for admission, could with special assistance, succeed at the University of Florida. (For a description of the EOP program, see Appendix A).

Four of the 143 black students came from low-income families. Their educational achievements were such that when measured by traditional standardized instruments, the results would ordinarily have precluded them from gaining admission to the university system of the State of Florida.

To prepare the students in the compensatory program for full participation in the regular college programs of the University of Florida, special services were provided throughout the freshman year such as tutoring, remedial, reading assistance and counseling services.

With the inception of this project, the administration and faculty of the University of Florida expanded the opportunities for higher education to disadvantaged and minority

Reactions of Negroes to Segregation in Schools, especially Negro Entrepreneurial Responses, measured by annual black students.

Research on the Negroes

Related research and research will be discussed under four main headings: (1) Negro students in Higher Education, (2) The educational process of Compensationary Programs, (3) Academic Production and Performance of Black students in Higher Education, and (4) Black students at the University of Florida, 1966-71.

Black Students in Higher Education

In 1960, the Bureau of the Census reported that the percent of non-white males completing high school had risen from 34 to 43 during the period of 1940-48. For non-white females the increase was from 41 to 48 percent. In spite of the rise in the number of black high school graduates, Coleman *et al.* (1966) reported that black students accounted for only 4.5 percent of the college population even though Black Americans comprise about 13 percent of the population in the United States. Hendrick (1967) stated that approximately half of these black students attended predominantly black colleges and the other half was enrolled mainly in private colleges and other relatively non-segregated institutions. In April of 1968, the Chronicle of Higher Education published enrollment figures by race which showed that

approximately 35,000 black students were enrolled in universities which undoubtedly have served a predominance of white students. This amounted to about 8 percent of the nationwide total enrollment (Bogard, 1968). Some progress is noted in a recent report released by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1972). It shows that enrollment of black students in 1971 rose to 8 percent.

In 1950, the Supreme Court ruled the segregation of black students in publicly supported graduate schools illegal. Since that same court in 1954 declared public school segregation illegal, "... state institutions were quickly on their way to being open to all regardless of race . . ." (Gordon, 1971, p. 118). But it was not until after Sputnik I was launched in 1957, that through the National Defense Education Act resources became available for the discovery of "talent." This, according to Gordon, forced predominantly white universities to begin viewing minority groups, and especially black minorities, as fruitful fields for recruiting academically promising students.

Little was done, however, to encourage and assist poorly prepared students to overcome academic deficiencies imposed on them by a starting environment over which they had no control. Gaynor and Walker (1964), as well as Carter and Herring (1978) have credited the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students (NSSF) for encouraging colleges and universities to start placing

emphasis be given to education that will complement and complement the performance of minority programs for disadvantaged students. (Cited Black college students in the best educational institutions in higher educational opportunity as the primary problem that all equal opportunity were to be aimed at and to "in all America, regardless of race, color, or religion, higher educational institutions must provide remedial and compensatory programs for disadvantaged students with public school preparation Negroes truly equal the students of all backgrounds" (Commission on Higher Education Opportunity in the South, 1947, p. 38). The Board recommended that each senior college and university adopt a "high risk" quota for the admission of disadvantaged students.

Traditionally, college admissions has served as a screening based on intellectual achievement and promise. Thornton (1968) pointed out, however, that most of the real admissions had all along been done by the accidents of socioeconomic origins, early environment, and the various levels of aspirations inherently characterizing particular groups and subcultures. For instance, colleges and universities accepted the "pool of ability" concept—the belief that higher education was the prerogative of only a small fraction of high school graduates drawn mainly from the well-to-do classes.

The determining factors that control every job higher education are listed in the box and

formal development of children from infancy on, were given the page for "retention" on the part of schools and universities to save the educational component as a superficial effort to reduce the educational distinctions of the various fractions of the population they had sought to teach the tenth grade without having the potential for further education damaged or destroyed. (Marshall, 1968, p. 8)

Marshall is typical in studies done by Hollingshead (1957) and Repetti (1960) which showed that "fathers" could not supply the money itself. It had to be solicited and helped, and encouraged. The "conditions of opportunity" to a large extent determined who went to college and where (Marshall, 1968, p. 10).

The types and causes of compensatory Programs in Modern Education

Compensatory education as a term which refers to programs designed at alleviating or eliminating normal deficiencies in the background, functioning, and normal experiences of youngsters from unusually deprived, vulnerable, isolated, and/or ethnically segregated families (Kornblum and Johnson, 1968). The development of such programs on the campuses of American colleges and universities is a relatively recent phenomenon. Among the social forces which argue to this development, Gordon and Wilkinson (1966) mentioned the growing need for educated support, increasing presence of the civil rights movement, new assumptions of the educability of the "lower classes," and philanthropic associations and experts. In addition, the millions of minority students already enrolled in

university. The Association of American Colleges in 1994, the National Center for Education Statistics, responsibility to serve low-income students, and the dramatic rise in college enrollment among students who now graduate from high school—these are all by now well-known. (1996) are most important factors contributing to the rise of compensatory education.

Hornbeck and Perna (1993) identified two major categories of compensatory education programs and policies: (1) those that assist disadvantaged students in entering institutions of higher learning, and (2) those that help them succeed in academic and entrepreneurial career programs once they have been enrolled. Gordon and Wilhite (1988) defined compensatory practices and programs

A continuing activity by an institution that helps disadvantaged students who could not otherwise do so to enroll and progress in college is . . . *called a compensatory practice.* . . . An unenrolled group of related activities to the ends and in . . . *called a compensatory program.* . . . (p. 134)

In their efforts to assist disadvantaged and minority students, colleges and universities have engaged in a variety of programs and practices. Besides aid programs, funded the following: non-expedited programs, reduced course load, remedial courses, tutorial assistance, guidance and counseling, extended taught or time to meet graduation requirements, and financial assistance. These are but a few

of the efforts that have been employed either singly or in combination to meet the needs of disadvantaged and minority students.

Gordon and McDermon (1988) published the results of an extensive survey of the nature and distribution of open-generosity practices among colleges and universities in the United States. Of the 8,000 institutions contacted, 418 responded representing 28.4 percent of the 2,810 colleges and universities in the 50 states and the District of Columbia during 1986-87. They found that the mainstream of higher education showed little or no concern for youth with educational handicaps born of poverty and discrimination. Moreover, it was noted that only 26.8 percent of the responding institutions had begun some form of compensatory programs and practices but that most of these seemed to fit "... the somewhat dreary pattern of remedial concern which has plagued this generation of low-income students with but little benefit to most of them" (p. 118).

A similar survey of 400 higher education institutions in five midwestern states done by Summons (1979) showed that of the 313 institutions which responded, only 20 percent had some form of compensatory practice or program for disadvantaged students. Most of these had been undertaken within the past two years and were found in institutions with less than 5,000 enrollment.

The 1980s were a period when attention to issues related to low-income, disadvantaged, and minority students (Gordon, 1990) increased and began serving approximately 45 percent of postsecondary students in two-year programs (Gordon, 1990). The figures for two-year community colleges were even more dramatic. Consequently, attention to the characteristics and effectiveness of compensatory programs in predominantly white institutions as limited as grants, will prove.

In reviewing the available research, Bealeck and Thomas (1970) noted that existing compensatory practices and programs seemed to be making little impact on eradicating the problems of disadvantaged students; the majority of colleges and universities had not accepted this as their role. Although in his 1988 critique to Congress on education, President Johnson concluded at a trough of Johnsonian despair that 99 percent of high school graduates were going on to college, Bealeck (1988) found that in the same year less than 21.5 percent of the 143 institutions responding to his survey had initiated programs for the disadvantaged. He observed that the question which held the attention of university administrators and faculty was not how to proceed with effective programs for the disadvantaged, but whether they should be considered engaged.

Opposition to compensatory education on the college level has involved several issues. One is based on the argument that minority students are not prepared and will not succeed in college, another is based on the feeling that acceptance of high school students will lower an institution's standards and will reduce its quality of education (Finn, 1978). Both Gordon (1984) and Beugre (1981) have argued that for compensatory programs to be successful, the nature and cause of poor school performance must be understood and that it is unacceptable to assume that poor performance of disadvantaged youngsters is a direct function of ability. Gordon (1984) believes that where compensatory programs have failed, there has been no recognition of the relationship between conditions of life, characteristics of the learner, and success in the teaching - learning process. Operators of compensatory programs have tried to help disadvantaged students by giving them some of what seems to work in educating middle and upper class youth.

What the literature reveals is a willingness on the part of colleges and universities to recruit "qualified" black students but a reluctance to associate with special programs aimed at helping youngsters overcome the disadvantages created by their environment. Chalk (1988) has pointed out the contradiction in granting admissions and financial aid to students who have excellent grades and are also exceptionally deprived for "what we are counting upon

In fact the student demonstrates exceptional merit despite his environment, inadequate dues, often times disrupted family life, marginal education, and very little encouragement" (p. 13). When the white middle-class student comes to college he has a natural advantage by virtue of his exposure to a college-oriented environment. He has undergone what Heron (1960) has referred to as "parasymptomatic socialization."¹ Steiner and Miller (1973) interviewed the white middle class and the black disadvantaged college-bound students. He stated that the white student, in his daily interaction with parents, peers and teachers has internalized the requirements of the role he will be expected to play upon entering college. Thus, however, is not the case with the black disadvantaged student because whatever cultural advantages he may enjoy, they have little relevance to the demands of the academic assessment (p. 29). If colleges and universities are serious in assisting black disadvantaged students to cope with institutional demands and to help them overcome the alienating effect of the impersonal, white middle class institutions, attention must be given to the special needs of these students requiring special counseling opportunities (Steiner and Miller, 1973).

Opposition has been leveled by black students, black leaders, and black college officials at the traditional ways in which applicants for admission to institutions of higher learning have been selected. They have challenged the use

of standardized tests to determine one's worth (Gurin and Trop, 1972). One of the two basic reasons to state University admissions by the Association of American Colleges in February, 1968, was that academic achievement in high school be the only criterion for black students' admission to that university (Gurin and Trop, 1972).

Academic prediction and performance of Black students in higher education

Access to higher education has traditionally been determined by the quality of past academic performance. High school grades and entrance examinations have been the two most favored means by which past academic performance has been measured. The validity of high school grades and test scores to predict academic performance in college has been the subject of considerable research (Gleason and Petree, 1963; Lewis, 1965). A positive correlation of .30 or higher has been considered sufficient evidence of a positive degree of relationship (Allaway, 1966).

As early as 1817, Lincoln reported a correlation of .49 between high school grades and academic performance in college while finding a correlation of less than .10 between entrance examinations and college grades. He concluded that the quality of work done in the secondary school was a better predictor of academic success in college than scores received on entrance examinations. Lincoln's findings supported those of Theodore, as will be discussed in Part

Report, and found a correlation of .50, which is a substantial measure that emphasizes just how much all four of these variables were related to college to have conclusion.

There is every reason to believe that of the students . . . who were not out, a fairly large percentage would have done better than any three of those who were admitted. Indeed, as noted there will be someone turned out who, if admitted, would be the best one in college. It is a small
atrocious to decide futures for college on (such) a system . . . (Garrison, 1917, p. 473)

Since 1907, there have been hundreds of studies done on predicting academic success in college. In all of these, high school grades have consistently been found to relate positively to academic performance in college with correlations reported from as low as .29 to as high as .83 with a median value of .54 (Gopal, 1934; Trabulock, 1938; Creibach, 1940; Maruya, 1940; Garrett, 1940; Ellis, 1940; Stanley and Parker, 1947; Richards and Davis, 1948; Wayne and Stanley, 1949; Hendry, 1970).

Notwithstanding Garrison's criticism, standardized measures of aptitude and achievement have been found to correlate positively with academic achievement in college although not as high as grades. Correlations reported range from .23 to .83 with a median value of .36 (Garrett, 1940; Ellis, 1940; Hollingshead, 1965; Pughes, 1967; Stanley and Parker, 1947; Richards and Davis, 1948; Cappedge, 1969; Hendry, 1970).

It has been found that academic prediction is improved when using high school grades in conjunction with standardized

black students resulting in multiple correlations with an average of .40 (Linn, 1964; Linn, 1968; Stanley and Foster, 1967; Stanley, 1970). Researchers have also found that women are more predictable academically than men (Glassman, 1968; Stanley, 1967; Stanley and Foster, 1967).

The question which has received considerable attention during the past two decades is whether or not predictors of academic achievement have the same validity for members of minority groups, especially Black Americans, whose educational opportunities may have been severely curtailed (Glassman *et al.*, 1964; Jenkins, 1969; Lipp, 1969; Thomas and Stanley, 1968; Tippin, 1971; Stanley, 1971).

Out of this has evolved much debate and now research to determine whether or not such standardized measures as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (hereafter referred to as the SAT) and the American College Test (hereafter referred to as the ACT) are biased against Black students (Bela, 1963; Bonaroff, 1964-65; Cleary and Wilson, 1964; Cleary, 1969; Davis and Tippin, 1971).

Black students and education leaders believe that standardized predictors of academic success are oriented toward white, middle-class students, and are inadequate for determining the potential of Black (Davis and Tippin, 1971). Bela (1963) discussed cultural bias in intelligence tests and stated that such tests were fair measures of educational aptitude not only for students in schools designed for the

white students. In this same article, Brundt (1964-65) reported that " . . . it is important to point that children who are markedly less successful academically are probably under-estimated while those who have high scholastic and by tests that white students" (p. 11). It is argued that it was " . . . extremely important that an unusually thorough investigation be made to determine whether or not the total achievement of the candidate over the years justifies a suspicion that the test does not fit the student" (p. 4).

Defining test bias, Cleary (1968) stated that " . . . the test is biased if the differences were predicted from the known regression line is consistently too high or too low for members of the subgroup" (p. 111). Studies done at Michigan State College last century (1940) to investigate that educational aptitude and achievement tests have low validity for low-income and groups of restricted educational background. This was further investigated by Cleary and Barnes (1960) who studied the variation of Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) raw scores in different racial and socioeconomic groups and by Cleary (1968) who studied the regression of college grades on the test for black and white students in integrated colleges. In the first study, large samples of black and white students were used from seven integrated schools in three large metropolitan areas. The purpose of that investigation was to learn (1) whether test items were equally difficult for all groups, (2) whether the

group mean scores across items differed by groups, and (3) whether both group means and subtest scores on individual items change as a function of race, independently standing within race, or both. It was concluded that the SAT, for practical purposes, was not biased for the groups studied. In the second study, Cleary (1980) investigated the possible bias of the SAT in predicting academic performance of black students in three integrated colleges. Data were collected from two eastern colleges and one southwestern college. Subjecting these data to an analysis of covariance, it was found that there were no significant differences in prediction for black and white students from the eastern colleges. At the southwestern college, however, it was found that the college grades of black students tended to be overpredicted by the use of the white or census regression lines. Similar results were obtained by Pfeiffer and Bellanca (1971) at the University of Maryland. Black students were overpredicted and it was suggested that analysis be conducted when using predictive equations based on predominantly white students.

Kallungal (1973) and Temp (1973) replicated Cleary's study and obtained similar results. Kallungal found the regression equations of sophomore year cumulative grade-point averages on free ability and achievement test scores for blacks and whites at Michigan State University showed significant differences. He had concluded that the use of the white regression equation for predicting black cumulative grade-point averages would result in overprediction or

the question unanswered. Tipp studied the validity of the SAT and high school students in various integrated institutions and concluded that, to predict first-year grades of black students, a separate regression equation should be utilized.

Horizon (1951) and Scarp (1971) studied the validity of the ACT placement battery for predicting the grades of students from disadvantaged backgrounds and reached somewhat contradictory conclusions. Hunday surveyed his inquiry as whether or not the validity of the ACT would be adversely affected in colleges whose students were predominantly black. Although the ACT scores for the black students were definitely lower than the national average by, nevertheless, found that the ACT battery was as useful for predicting college grades of students as black colleges as it was for predicting the grades of other students. Hunday's subjects were students in five predominantly black colleges located in four different southern states. Scarp (1971), on the other hand, studied the comparative validity of the ACT battery to measure the achievement of Anglos and Negro-Americans in one large Texas state university. Anglo-American students had scored significantly higher than the Negro-American students on the ACT battery, yet, when first semester grade-point averages became available, there were no significant differences found between the two groups. Since the ACT scores had suggested that the Negro-American

group would achieve considerably lower scores. It can be concluded to keep that the SAT battery has a built-in ethnic bias and that scores obtained on this battery when used for admissions to college would cover because which tended to systematically discriminate against certain ethnic groups.

There has been no research to determine the validity of the Florida Twelfth Grade Test to predict academic performance of black students. In 1964, the Educational Testing Service published the results of a validity study which showed the Florida Twelfth Grade Test to have a correlation of .22 with final term Freshman grades at the University of Florida. When high school dependent scores were used, a multiple correlation of .55 was obtained. The subjects in this study were all white.

Research into the actual academic performance of black students in higher education, especially in compensatory programs, is sparse. Campbell and Ferguson (1971) regard this as "... particularly disturbing in the light of present criticism being directed against the use of the usual predictors of academic success to determine minority students' eligibility for admission to college" (p. 340).

Clark and Plotkin (1963) found that the academic performance of the 90 black students in integrated colleges they studied was considerably above the level predicted by such indices as the SAT. Thirty-one percent achieved an average of B- or better and 18 percent achieved a C- or

lower for the four years. Slightly less than 20 percent of the group studied graduated with honors and 1 percent was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. The authors reported a drop-out rate of 14 percent. Clark and Flotter concluded that non-institutional factors were probably more important than institutional factors in the demonstrated propensity of black students in completing college.

The academic success of black students at the University of Missouri was investigated by Sample and Beynon (1991). A sample of 383 black students was matched with a sample of white students using high school rank and scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as predictor variables. Although the two groups matched evenly on high school grade-point average, the group of white students showed significantly higher SAT scores. The results showed that the white students achieved significantly higher grades in college than the black students. The mean college grade-point average for black females, male and female, was well below a C (3.0) average. Sample and Beynon concluded that the data in their study supported that for black students, especially males, some of the well-established predictors of academic success had little or no relevance. In an attempt to site what Sample and Beynon asked the question "You should think black students be selected so that there is some assurance that they will be able to succeed academically?" (p. 246). A more relevant question might have been "How could we have helped these students to succeed?" For

the truth of the matter is that the minority student is having a very busy and rather difficult time of it.

He is plagued by money problems, he is working very hard in his studies, he is having to make the social and even the physical arrangements sometimes with sympathetic circumstances and sometimes without, and he is having to work out his future in a curriculum which did not originally take him into account. . . . (Bunting, 1970, p. 105)

Compensatory practices and programs have provided some ways in which black students have been helped to succeed. There is, unfortunately, little published research to indicate how these practices and programs are succeeding. Powers (1970) compared the performance

marksmanship of regularly admitted students and disadvantaged freshmen at the University of Illinois. The students were 515 disadvantaged freshmen, most of whom were black, who had been admitted to the Special Educational Opportunities Program. For these students, concerned faculty and staff and tutorial services had been budgeted, and several departments had developed special first year courses for these freshmen. First semester grade-point averages were obtained for both regularly admitted and specially admitted freshmen. For the latter group, the averages were based upon grades earned in regular courses as well as grades earned in the special courses. The mean grade-point average earned by the disadvantaged students in the special courses was higher than in the regular courses. Some additional

about 1900 students in 1966-67, and many more added that different learning programs for the two types of courses were confronted with groups. Since however the special students was expected to continue the Day Program, Powers suggested that the effectiveness of special programs could better be evaluated on the basis of how successfully they prepared especially admitted black students for later regular course work.

The staff of the experimental program in Higher Education at the University of Minnesota (Minneapolis) studied the performance of students admitted to that program (Dr. R. Murray, personal communication, July 12, 1972). Eighty-nine percent of the students did not meet the advanced requirements of the university of Minnesota. The results showed the students received a mean grade-point average of 2.09 with over 90 percent achieving at least a 2.00.

The Educational Opportunities Program of the State University of New York at Buffalo was evaluated by the staff Dr. R. Lynn, personal communication, July, 1972). Since the beginning of the program in 1968 with 130 students, 31 percent had graduated, 60 percent had graduated and 9 percent were still in the program. The students who graduated had a cumulative overall grade-point average of 2.81 which was slightly below the average of 3.00 for the entire graduating class. The conclusion was reached by the Buffalo University Staff that the opportunities and special services

provided for the "high rank" students had realized their goal of helping them to succeed in the University of Buffalo.

A number of researchers have attempted to find a relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and academic performance in college. In most studies, SES was measured by some objective technique rather than by subjective ratings (Davis, 1968, *et. al.*). "The objective techniques all involve the combining or weighting of scores on variables such as occupation, education, income, attendance at private or public college, area of residence, and the like so as to provide an index of the position of the student's family in the status hierarchy" (Davis, 1968, p. 123).

Lewis has stated that SES is a derivative of primary -
ing variable: persons of different socioeconomic status
face different kinds of life situations, and in adapting to
them, they may develop different sets of values and life
styles which may influence school performance (p. 123).

Intelligence has been found to relate positively with socioeconomic status (Brooks, 1955; Knott and Strood, 1959; Mitchell, 1956). However, in one study it was found that when SES is controlled, the relationship between intelligence and grades was not lowered (Freudhoff, 1959). This raises the question as to the predictive validity of SES factors. Freudhoff found that when intelligence was controlled, correlations between SES and grades dropped from a range of .37 to .47 to a range of .26 to .33. Similar findings were reported by Knott and Strood.

Bevan (1968) found a relationship between SES and achievement motivation. Students who demonstrated high levels of motivation came from higher status levels but low motivation was associated with the relation between SES and grade was almost eliminated. Levin (1965) stated this to be illustrative of the fact that SES measured other variables. From his review of the research it was concluded that socioeconomic status is usually positively related to academic performance, but that at the college level the relationship is inverse when the range of income runs from the upper to the middle class (pp. 227-230). When considered together with such academic predictors as grades and test scores, the increase in the multiple correlations is not significant.

Burke and Malt (1983) found a relationship between the academic achievement of white families and parents' marital status. Those from broken homes experienced greater difficulty in adapting to the college environment.

Northuppon and Knack (1971) found a relationship between family income and academic success. It was considered likely that a student from a family with a given income would be in a relatively higher or lower socioeconomic status group depending on the geographical location of the high school attended. Therefore, the student may be affected by different socioeconomic factors than a student with the same family income who attends another high school.

Hoyer (1977) found no consistent low or neutralization of a high school effect on college-grade distribution of the students and conclusion that:

Whether the presence of one, higher status students perniciously by creating an informal peer climate favorable toward the college, or by building an educational support network after the parent expectations and standards is not clear. (p. 58)

Nevertheless, Hoyer found the observed effect of status upon college achievement to be greater than had usually been reported.

The relationship between socioeconomic status and academic performance is not consistent but Lareau (1988) has pointed out that socioeconomic status is an important variable to investigate because it summarizes systematic variations in attitudes, motivations, and value systems, all of which are related to academic performance (p. 41).

Black students at the University of Florida, 1972-73

Various researchers have drawn attention to the influence of achievement signs (see see Ross and Stern, 1988; Ross, 2008; Stern, 2002). Studies cited by Stern (1982) suggest that selective academic performances are related to differences in response which the more affluent achievement signs from each of several diverse subgroups of students (p. 202).

That the environment or campus climate prevailing on predominantly white colleges and universities has influenced

theoretical justification of white students was suggested by Rennolds (1970) who stated that the black students " . . . in having . . . made the social and even the physical environment did not have any such role [in] his future in a community which did not adequately take his race account" (p. 43-44).

Reports of events which occurred during the 1970-71 academic year at the University of Florida give evidence that the visiting black students found little harmony with the then prevailing "separatist climate." It prompted the mayor of Gainesville—a black American—to charge "I don't believe the UF administration realizes the extent of the racial anger UF has with blacks around the nation" (Garrison, 1971). This ambivalent statement was made after black students had blocked the office of the university president and had presented him with a list of grievances and demands. The president's refusal to accede to the demands resulted in violence and the arrest of 72 students, most of whom were black (Giddick, 1971). Shortly thereafter, 125 black students withdrew from the University in protest, drawing subsequently an investigation by the Southern Regional Council which in its preliminary report made the statement that

... the University must become a place where the cultural processes of our society limit the pullout and freeze separation. It must become a University which all students—white, black, or red—feel is theirs, one in which they have a vital stake and one in which they can find a valuable and valuable education. (Gainesville Reg., 1 June, 1971, p. 6)

A day-long hearing held on the campus of the University of Florida by the sub-committee of the Florida Civil Rights Advisory Committee convinced us that the attitude toward minority students was not good and that " . . . the university administration did not comprehend the problems facing students who are members of minority groups" (Quastek, 1970).

It seems reasonable to infer from the events as reported that the prevailing environment on the campus of the University of Florida during the 1970-71 academic year may have influenced the academic performance of the black students--many of whom were enrolled in a compensatory program which offered certain advantages. In a statement attributed to the then chairman of the Florida Board of Regents, it was said that:

the appropriate place for the preparation of blacks for university level work is in the primary and secondary schools and not in the freedom schools of our state universities. (Garrison, 1971)

Making life more bearable for black students was a task that could not be accomplished by the University in the short period of 12 months, i.e., between the time the first group of black students was admitted and the time many of them withdrew. That considerable progress has been made may be deduced from a report which alleges that when the entire state system of higher education came under criticism from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the

failure to desegregate more thoroughly, the Florida board of regents looked to the University of Florida for a model to emulate (Comer, 1972).

Summary

The review of the literature and research has shown that an interesting number of black students are graduating from high school but that they are still not well represented in integrated institutions of higher education. Several recent efforts have been directed at the "qualified" black student. Little effort has been made to bring forth ability among black students whose opportunities for the development of that ability have been thwarted by circumstances.

Most research has been directed at predicting the academic performance of black students with contrasting results. The literature suggests that academic performance of black students should be measured against norms developed within their own group. Published research to determine the effectiveness of compensatory programs is almost nonexistent.

Some relationship appears to exist between socioeconomic factors and academic performance in college. Although there is little positive potential in these findings, the results do suggest that black students may have special needs that cannot be met by traditional programs and curriculums.

Research has also measured the proportion that the generalizing concept endorsement may influence the academic performance of certain subgroups of students.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the answers to the following questions:

1. Is it possible to differentiate between the group of black freshmen making satisfactory academic progress and the group of black freshmen making unsatisfactory academic progress at the University of Florida on the basis of the following selected variables: participation in the compensatory program, high school grade-point average, total score on the Florida Twelfth Grade Test, sex, graduation from all black or integrated high school, family income, and family marital status?
2. Within a time period of three quarters, how well have black freshmen, admitted to the compensatory program, performed academically as compared to black freshmen admitted to the regular academic program?

The Need for the Study

In 1970, the administration of the University of Florida implemented a program designed to meet the educational needs of black students. It has become necessary to determine the usefulness of the program. The Senate Report (1972) has suggested that for minority education to be improved, it is vitally necessary to evaluate what practices have been effective and what have not.

Since compensatory education can only enhance at the University of Florida, the administration should assist operating in an area in which it had no effective source of prior experience upon which to draw. And as pointed out by Braxton and Brown (1972), research on the extensiveness and effectiveness of compensatory programs and practices was limited in quantity and scope.

If decisions are to be made relative to the future development and management of the program, data must be collected to assist in decision making. This data must contribute to making the most appropriate choice among various alternative ways in which black students may be assisted in realizing their educational goals at the University of Florida. In discussing the evaluation of programs for blacks, Braxton and Brown (1972) indicate that "questions about whether a program for blacks will be modified or deleted, reduced or phased out, drastically altered or expanded need to be asked at some point" (p. 55). Questions must be asked

and career opportunities had been in the training program and curriculum two years previously.

Most important, however, from a social welfare view the black students' "problem" must be met. The program was initiated for this, and its objective is to increase their choices for students. . . . Because they are classified "disadvantaged," does not mean they comprise a homogeneous group. Durkin (1971) claimed that there may well be many variations in the problems faced by such students as they are drawn; therefore, they should be carefully defined and their special needs should be related to the kind of programs that are provided.

If the results of the study were to show that on the basis of the variables selected there exist no differences between black students making unsatisfactory academic progress and black students not making unsatisfactory academic progress, additional variables will need to be investigated. If differences are found, then, what needs to be further studied is whether students making unsatisfactory academic progress have needs that are not being met by the program. If, in relation to academic performance, no differences are found between black students admitted to the Expanded Educational Opportunities Program and black students admitted to regular academic programs, additional criteria may need to be evaluated.

Methodology

From the review of the literature it is clear that most previous research has concerned itself with predicting the academic performance of black students and with comparing their performance to achievement of white students. Little effort has been made to learn about black students per se. In this study the interest was centered upon how black students perform academically. Considering the differences in educational and economic opportunity, high school performance, and achievement status, it was conjectured that differences in levels of academic performance would most likely exist between black and white students at the University of Florida.

The rationale for this study was to learn about the black students on the campus of the University of Florida. Specifically, it was aimed to investigate whether on the basis of selected variables it was possible to separate the successful from the less successful black students. Hopefully the results would contribute to learning more about how the needs of the black students could be met. By limiting the study to the black students, the effects of possible kept factors present--in the Florida High School Test and differences in the "conditions of opportunity" were reduced.

Definitions of Terms

Inadequate program.--University of Florida regulations state that students who achieve an overall 2.0 academic average or higher are making satisfactory progress.

Insufficient progress.--Students whose overall academic average is less than a 2.0 are considered to be making insufficient progress.

Group 1.--Designation for the 39 students in this study making unsatisfactory progress.

Group 2.--Designation for the 46 students in this study making satisfactory progress.

Individ.--Grade-point average.

Initial Placement Test.--The Florida Thirteenth Grade Test by which it is commonly known.

IPD.--Course designation for Comprehensive English.

Joint home.--This term refers to the marital status of the student's parents and is meant to indicate that the parents are not divided by divorce or separation.

Separate home.--This term refers to the marital status of the student's parents and is meant to indicate that the parents are divided by divorce or separation.

Supplementary program.--the Expanded Educational Opportunities Program.

Regular program.--Courses of study to which students have been admitted who meet all admissions requirements and for whom no special activities have been specifically designed.

Comparative students,—Students admitted to the
university conventional opportunities Program.

Regular students,—Students admitted to regular pro-
grams.

CHAPTER 3.1

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The study was designed to determine (1) whether the compensatory program had been helpful to帮助 the freshman student in lower-division courses, and (2) whether the two groups of black students—the making substantial academic progress, the other making nonsubstantial academic progress—could be distinguished from each other on the basis of selected variables. The independent variables selected are specified below in the section Data Collection and represented factors that were available in the student records at the University of Florida.

The academic performance of the black students was observed over a period of three quarters. During this time period special services were provided to students in the compensatory program. (An explanation of these services is found in Appendix A.)

The independent variables were assigned to determine their relationship to academic performance of black students. The data analysis sought to identify the combination of variables which discriminated markedly between black students who at the end of the third quarter had an overall 3.0

academic average 4.0 or better and were thus making satisfactory progress and black students who at the end of the third quarter did not have an overall 2.0 academic average and were, consequently, not making satisfactory progress. The analysis was made for black students admitted to the compensatory program as well as for black students admitted to the regular program.

Description of Population

The subjects for this study were the 361 black students admitted to the University of Florida in June and September, 1970. Eighty-two of the students did not meet the minimum requirements for admission and were enrolled in the Extended Educational Opportunities Program (hereafter referred to as the compensatory group). Of the 279 black students who did meet the requirements for admission (hereafter referred to as the regular group) approximately half commenced their program in June, the other half in September. In Table 1 are listed the mean high school grade-point average and test scores of the two groups. Both groups presented a mean high school grade-point average above the required 2.0. The average total Florida twelfth grade test score of the compensatory group was 46 points below the required minimum of 390 for admission to the University. The regular group presented an average Florida twelfth grade placement score 36 points above the minimum requirement of

360 for admission to the University. The average total Florida High School Test score for the entire entering freshman class that year was 422.

Table 1 - Average high school grade-point average and average Florida Test/Florida Grade Test scores of black freshmen admitted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970

Subject Group	N	Florida Test/Florida Grade Test						Mean
		Age	Sex	AS	BS	MS	LS	
Compensatory-Male	38	2.03	60	64	54	56	55	53.0
Compensatory-Female	42	2.01	47	56	51	43	52	51.0
Regular -Male	18	2.00	13	67	56	74	53	57.0
Regular -Female	31	2.00	47	74	61	69	69	67.0

In Table 2 are indicated the number of black students who graduated from all black or integrated high schools. As may be seen, the larger number of students came from high schools in which the enrollment was all black.

Table 2 - Number of black freshmen admitted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1970, who came from all black or integrated high schools

Subject Group	All Black H.S.	Integrated H.S.
Compensatory	234 (48%)	216 (41%)
Regular	639 (63%)	316 (36%)
Total	873	532

Table 3 lists the average family income of the students and as Table 4 we found the percentage of students who came from either broken or intact homes.

Table 3 - Number and average family income of black freshmen accepted to compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1979

Income group	1979				
	\$2,500- \$4,000	\$4,000- \$11,000	\$11,000- \$20,000	\$20,000- \$30,000	\$30,000+
Compensatory	N=38	N=29	N=19	N=12	N= 2
	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
	\$12,99	\$20,12	\$13,22	\$14,20	\$24,66
Regular	N= 9	N=14	N=14	N=13	N= 9
	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
	\$14,10	\$24,14	\$14,21	\$15,57	\$11,76

Table 4 - Number of black freshmen accepted to the compensatory and regular programs at the University of Florida in 1979 who came from broken or intact homes

Income group	Broken home	Intact home
Compensatory	37% (31)	63% (51)
Regular	33% (13)	66% (46)
Total	44	87

In summary, the data show that, as a group, students assigned to the compensatory program can be distinguished from the group of students admitted to the regular program by the following factors: on the average, they had earned lower grades in high school. The differences, however, were minimal although somewhat larger for male students than for female students. On the Florida Twelfth Grade Test, compensatory students had, on the average, obtained a score 16 points lower than the average score obtained by the regular students.

A higher percentage of compensatory students graduated from non-integrated high schools. Also, a higher percentage of them came from homes in which the family had been disunited by divorce or separation of parents.

The average annual family income appears to have been somewhat higher for the compensatory students (\$1,816.00) than for the regular students (\$1,291.00), however, it should be pointed out that this students came from families with an annual income far above \$21,000.00. The inclusion of these two incomes is responsible for infecting the average family income of the compensatory group to such an extent that it gives a misleading impression. If category 5 is not included, the average annual income would show higher for the families of the regular students. Therefore, it seems safe to state that, on the average, students in the compensatory group came from families with a lower annual income.

Collection of Data

The data for this study were obtained from student records maintained by the registrar, the financial aid office, and the board of trustees at the University of Florida. The review of the literature suggested that data such as high school grade-point average and test scores represented variables which had been found to be valid predictors of academic performance. The literature also suggested a relationship between non-economic factors, high school environment, and academic performance in college. Data were collected for each subject to make up the following variables:

1. Participation in the compensatory program.
2. High school grade-point average.
3. Total Florida twelfth grade Test score.
4. Graduation from all Black or segregated high school.
5. Sex.
6. Marital status of family (broken or intact home).
7. Family income.

Two additional variables were created to test for interaction between participation in the compensatory or regular programs and sex.

Analysis of Data

To analyze the data, use was made of a statistical technique known as discriminant analysis. This technique is proposed as a solution to the problem of using information

from a group of correlated variables to classify an unclassified subject into one of two groups to which he must belong (Nelissen and Wolden, 1956). The data were analyzed to determine the group an individual was most like (Nelissen, 1951). This was done by making some linear combination of the variables that maximized the "between"-group difference relative to the "within"-group differences (Nelissen, 1949). For a more detailed explanation of this technique, the reader is referred to Appendix C.

The statistical treatment employed was a discriminant analysis. The two groups being a Biometrical Computer Program - DISCRIM - available at the University of Florida computing Center for use with the University's IBM 360 computer. This particular program computes a linear function of p variables based on each individual of the groups and can serve as an index for discrimination between the groups. The index is determined from the criterion of "best" of all possible indices is that the difference between the mean indices for the two groups divided by a pooled standard deviation of the indices is maximized (Cron, 1971, p. 188). The two groups between which this program discriminated were (1) the group that had satisfactory academic progress (2.0 grade-point average or better) at the end of the Winter quarter, 1971, and (2) the group that did not make satisfactory academic progress (less than a 2.0 grade-point average) at the end of the 1971 Winter quarter. The analysis used

posted data with participation in the cooperative program or regular program as two of the independent variables.

Limitations

- I. Relationship to college is a socialization experience. Whether a student succeeds academically or not, the socialization experience may contribute to his sense of values, to his understanding of himself, and to his ability to relate to others. The study, however, was limited to distinguishing between two groups of black students on the basis of an academic achievement and the membership of the cooperative program was measured against that criterion only. The measurement of whatever else a student gained from the program was beyond the scope of this study.
- II. The subjects of this study were the black students admitted to the University of Florida in July and September, 1970. Although the methods employed in this study may be applicable to similar ones at other collegiate institutions, no claim is made that the results can be generalized.
- III. It is recognized that academic performance may be influenced by health, personality factors, peer group relations and campus environment. Such variables were not explored. The study, therefore, was limited to independent variables available from student records.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

The discriminant analysis classified the 141 black students into a group of subjects making unsatisfactory progress (Group I) and a group of subjects making satisfactory progress (Group II). Group I contained 55 subjects who, at the end of the Winter quarter, 1971, had not earned less than an overall 2.0 grade-point average. In Group II there were 86 subjects who at the end of the 1971 Winter quarter had each earned a 2.0 or higher grade-point average at the University of Florida.

The first step in the discriminant analysis was to determine the usefulness of each of a set of variables in classifying the students in the population into either Group I or Group II.

Table 5 presents the means of the two groups for each of the variables. It may be observed from this table that the two groups differed in each variable by negligible amounts. It was apparent that no single variable by itself was useful in discriminating between the two groups of students. The possibility existed, however, that combinations of these variables could be useful in separating the two groups.

Category	Definition	Example
Geography	Geographical location	North America
Demographics	Demographic profile	Age, gender, education level
Psychographics	Psychographic profile	Interests, hobbies, values
Behavioral	Behavioral profile	Purchase history, website visits
Technological	Technological profile	Device usage, app usage
Geographic	Geographic profile	Location, travel history
Demographic	Demographic profile	Age, gender, education level
Psychographic	Psychographic profile	Interests, hobbies, values
Behavioral	Behavioral profile	Purchase history, website visits
Technological	Technological profile	Device usage, app usage

TABLE 5 - TURBIDITY DATA

Using the discriminant analysis technique provided by the Biometrical Computer Program - BMDP4B - F ratios were obtained for each of several combinations of the variables. The first analysis employed all 13 variables, x_1, \dots, x_{13} , identified in table 3.

Table 4 shows that the F ratio obtained for this full model was 1.78 which was not significant at the .05 level. Thus, using all variables, the linear combination did not yield a profile by which the two groups of students could be differentiated.

By eliminating one of the interaction variables, x_{13} , the change in the degrees of freedom resulted in an F ratio of 3.11 which was significant at the .05 level. Thus the model, x_1, \dots, x_{12} , could be used with greater accuracy than guessing to differentiate between the black students in this study and to classify each subject into either the group making unsatisfactory progress (Group II) or, into the group making satisfactory progress (Group III). The discriminant separation between the two groups may be found in Appendix B.

The model, however, did not reveal which of the variables contributed to the significance of the model and which did not. Using various combinations by eliminating one or more variable(s) at a time, it may be noted from Table 4 that the model remained significant only as long as high school grade-point average (x_9) was included as one of the independent variables. When high school grade-point average

table 6 - linear combination F ratios resulting when one or more variables are deleted from a combination of variables to discriminate between a group of subjects making unsatisfactory progress and a group of subjects making satisfactory progress at the University of Florida

Variable Combinations	Variable (s) (eliminated)	df	F	significance at .05 level
$x_1 \dots x_{11}$	-	13, 127	1.73	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12}$	x_{12}	12, 128	2.17	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} x_{13}$	x_{13}	11, 129	1.93	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} x_{13} x_{14}$	x_{14}	10, 130	1.89	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15}$	x_{15}	10, 130	2.10	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16}$	x_{16}	9, 131	0.19	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} \dots x_{16}$	x_6	12, 127	2.37	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_{12} x_{13} \dots x_{16}$	x_6	11, 128	0.37	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6$	x_6	12, 127	2.45	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} \dots x_{16}$	x_6	10, 130	0.79	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12}$	x_6	11, 129	2.84	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13}$	x_6	10, 130	2.37	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14}$	x_6	10, 130	2.71	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15}$	x_6	10, 130	0.48	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16}$	x_6	9, 131	2.00	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16} x_{17}$	x_6	10, 130	0.86	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16} x_{17} x_{18}$	x_6	10, 130	0.86	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16} x_{17} x_{18} x_{19}$	x_6	10, 130	0.84	ns
$x_1 \dots x_{11} x_6 x_{12} x_{13} x_{14} x_{15} x_{16} x_{17} x_{18} x_{19} x_{20}$	x_6	10, 130	0.32	ns
$x_1 x_3$	$x_3 x_2 x_4 x_5 x_6 \dots x_{16}$	10, 128	0.32	ns
$x_1 x_3$	$x_3 x_2 x_4 x_5 x_6 \dots x_{16}$	10, 128	1.33	ns
$x_2 x_3$	$x_1 x_3 x_4 x_5 x_6 \dots x_{16}$	9, 129	0.39	ns
$x_2 x_3$	$x_1 x_3 x_4 x_5 x_6 \dots x_{16}$	9, 129	1.33	ns

After one year of training time, none of the combinations of variables discussed earlier were able to separate the two groups. Factors such as prior placement score, whether or not an all-black or all-white high school, family income, or marital status of parents these were variables which did not contribute significantly to predicting whether a subject would be more like those in the group making satisfactory or unsatisfactory academic progress.

By the beginning to discuss the participation in the compensatory program did contribute significantly to the discriminant model. The only variable in the discriminant model found to be significant was high school grade-point average. Yet, on the basis of this variable, it would not have been possible to classify the 341 black students from one of the two groups with a degree of accuracy much greater than chance alone. The difference in mean high school grade-point average for each group and the standard deviation was small while the range of high school grades was wide for each group and highly overlapping (Table 2). The slightly smaller standard deviation for the 55 students in group 1 would indicate that it was somewhat more homogeneous than group 22 in terms of high school achievement but the overlapping wide ranges of high school grades would make it difficult to achieve a clear separation.

Table 3 - Range, mean, and standard deviation of high school grade-point averages for students making satisfactory academic progress (Group II) and students making unsatisfactory academic progress (Group III) at the University of Florida

	Range	Mean	S.D.
Group II	1.8 - 3.8	2.55	.42
Group III	1.8 - 3.8	2.45	.43

The only criterion used to assign a student to the compensatory or the regular program was the total score on the senior placement test. The discriminant analysis did not show this test score to be useful in determining whether a black student was more like those in the group making satisfactory progress or the group making unsatisfactory progress. Although the difference in the mean scores obtained by the group assigned to the compensatory program and the group assigned to the regular program was almost 160 points, the difference in the mean scores between the group making satisfactory progress and the group making unsatisfactory progress was only seven points (Table 3).

High school grade-point averages notwithstanding, it would not be wise that on the basis of the variations selected, it is not possible to discriminate between black students who at the end of three quarters have earned a 2.0 or better grade-point average and those who at the end of three quarters have earned less than a 2.0 grade-point average at the University of Florida.

Table 8 shows that of the 50 students making the compensatory progress, 31 (62%) had term 1 and 2 higher semester-point averages by the second term of the following quarter. Of the 50 students who continued their studies in the regular program, 31 (62%) had done so.

Table 8 - Percentage of black students making compensatory or regular who were making satisfactory progress (Group 3) or unsatisfactory progress (Group 4)

	All	Group 3	Group 4
Compensatory students	33	30% (93)	41% (131)
Regular students	36	30% (94)	44% (151)

Similarly, Table 9 shows that of the 50 students making unsatisfactory progress (Group 4), 31 (62%) were enrolled in the compensatory program and 31 (62%) were participants in the regular program. Table 9 also indicates that a greater percentage of the students making unsatisfactory progress were enrolled in the compensatory program, 58 percent as compared to 41 percent who participated in the regular program.

table 8 = Percentage of students classified as Group I or Group II who were enrolled in either the compensatory or regular program

	<u>E</u>	<u>Compensatory</u>	<u>Regular</u>
Group I	55	54% (33)	61% (38)
Group II	80	51% (33)	63% (41)

However, with the exception of the high school grade-point average, none of the variables used in this analysis contributed significantly to determining whether a subject was more like those making satisfactory progress or unsatisfactory progress; a multiple regression analysis was done to learn what relationship the variables had to the grade-point-average earned at the University of Florida by the end of the 1970 winter quarter.

This analysis utilized the Statistical Computer Program = SPSS/360 = a program which provided a correlation matrix, means and standard deviations, regression coefficients and their standard errors, intercepts, and multiple correlation coefficients.

For the regression analysis, data were pooled for all 163 subjects. Correlation coefficients are shown in Table 10 and the results of the analysis in Table 11.

Table 16 - Matrix of correlation coefficients for seven independent variables and grade-point average earned at the University of Florida by 343 black students

	Percent deviation in supplementary page	1960	High school grade-point average	Percent deviation in 1960 test score	Percent deviation in 1960 test score	Family income	Percent deviation	Debt of Fla. 9-12
Percent deviation in supplementary page	1.00	-.04	-.16	-.01	.11	-.13	-.19	-.03
Age	-.08	1.00	-.18	.14	-.08	-.08	-.08	.007
High school g.p.a.	-.24	-.18	1.00	.22	-.08	.11	.14	.19
Family: Fluorine-1960	-.01	.14	.03	1.00	-.16	.09	.19	.11
Supplementary high school	.11	-.04	-.08	-.18	1.00	-.15	-.18	-.13
Family income	-.17	-.05	.13	.23	-.19	1.00	.03	.14
Parents' marital status	-.09	-.06	.14	.19	-.20	.03	1.00	.13
Debt of Fla. 9-12	-.05	-.007	.29	.13	-.12	.14	.13	1.00

Concept	Definition	Example	Notes
Protein	Large, complex molecules composed of amino acids linked together by peptide bonds.	Whey protein, casein, albumin, globulins, fibrinogen, collagen, keratin, hemoglobin, myoglobin, insulin, growth hormone, enzymes, antibodies, etc.	Proteins are the structural and functional components of living organisms.
Protein structure	Primary structure: sequence of amino acids in a polypeptide chain. Secondary structure: alpha-helices and beta-sheets. Tertiary structure: folded polypeptide chain. Quaternary structure: multiple polypeptide chains interacting to form a functional protein.	Alpha-helix, beta-sheets, tertiary structure, quaternary structure.	Protein structure determines its function.
Protein synthesis	Process by which proteins are synthesized in cells. It involves transcription of DNA into mRNA, and translation of mRNA into protein.	Transcription, mRNA, translation, ribosomes, tRNA, amino acids.	Protein synthesis is a complex process involving many cellular components.
Protein function	Proteins perform various functions in the body, including structural support, catalysis, transport, regulation, and defense.	Structural support (collagen, keratin), catalysis (enzymes), transport (hemoglobin, insulin), regulation (hormones), defense (immunoglobulins).	Proteins are essential for life processes.

Proteins are large, complex molecules composed of amino acids linked together by peptide bonds. They perform various functions in the body, including structural support, catalysis, transport, regulation, and defense. Protein synthesis is a complex process involving many cellular components. Protein structure determines its function.

the regression equation may be specified as follows:

b_0	=	constant term
b_1	=	coefficient of high school grade-point average
b_2	=	coefficient of sex
b_3	=	coefficient of family income
b_4	=	coefficient of parental education

The parameters may be denoted as

$$y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4$$

where

b_1, b_2, \dots	$=$	regression coefficients of variables
x_1, x_2, \dots, x_4	$=$	variables
b_0	$=$	constant term
y	$=$	predicted g.p.a. at the University of Florida.

Employing the above formula, the contribution each variable made to the mean grade-point average earned by the total group of subjects was calculated from the data shown in table II. That mean was 3.67 and was accounted for as follows:

$$3.67 = .38 + 0.261 (.58) + 1.115 (.48) + (-.42) (2.73) + \\ 1.86061 (2.62) + (-.24) (.38) + (.30) (2.72) + \\ 1.861 (4.67), \text{ or}$$

alpha	.14
compensatory program	.15
sex	.08
high school grade-point average	1.116
under placement score	.42
non-attested high school	-.38
family income	.30
parents' marital status	.34
mean grade-point average	<u>3.67</u>

As was evident, the regression model associated high school grade-point average with the greatest contribution to the mean grade-point average earned at the University of Florida. In the model, senior placement test score made the second greatest contribution although considerably less than high school grade-point average. Of the total contributions made by all variables, participation in the compensatory program accounted for about 8 percent while each factor as sex, family income, and parents marital status had little influence on the mean grade-point average earned at the University of Florida.

Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting when independent variables are added to a regression model, showing the relationship between those variables and grade-point average earned by the 140 black students are shown in Table 12.

Table 12 - Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting as independent variables are added to a regression model showing the relationship between the variables and GPA earned by 140 black students

Variable Added	<u>r</u>	<u>R</u>
compensatory program	.448	.448
sex	.087	.048
high school G.P.A.	.294	.333
senior placement test score	.030	.030

table 12 (continued)

<u>Variable Added</u>	<u><i>F</i></u>	<u><i>R</i>²</u>
non-integrated high school	1.000	.000
Family income	1.042	.042
parents' marital status	1.127	.037

Similar correlations are shown in tables 13 and 14 respectively for the 40 students in Group I and 100 students in Group II.

Table 13 - Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) resulting in independent variables and added to a regression model involving the relationship between the variables and the mean by 10 block students holding secondary progress constant

<u>Variable Added</u>	<u><i>F</i></u>	<u><i>R</i>²</u>
secondary progress	1.143	.143
age	-.629	.144
high school grade	.248	.109
minor placement test score	-.281	.100
non-integrated high school	-.255	.107
Family income	-.239	.100
parents' marital status	-.203	.097

Table 14 - Correlations in and multiple correlations
 (1) resulting in independent variables are added to
 a regression model testing the relationship between
 the variables and the earned by 9th grade students
 during their secondary programs.

Variable added	<i>R</i>	<i>Ab</i>
compensatory program	-.399	.309
SES	-.323	.303
high school diploma	.288	.297
senior placement test scores	.284	.298
non-integrated high school	-.287	.295
family income	-.303	.400
parents' highest education	.288	.400

As data were gathered and analyzed, the notion arose that students in the compensatory program might have benefited to some extent from grading patterns different from those used for students in the regular program. That notion was explored to determine whether or not this was indeed the case.

At the University of Florida, all students were required to complete a number of courses in general education. As indicated in Appendix B, special sections were designed to add students in the compensatory program in the areas of Comprehensive English, Comprehensive Social Studies,

Comprehensive Physical Sciences, Comprehensive Logic, and Fundamentals of Mathematics. In the 1970-71 academic year, achievement in Comprehensive Social Studies, Comprehensive Physical Sciences, and Comprehensive Logic was measured by a standardized instrument which was administered to the students in the comprehensive program as well as to the students enrolled in the regular program.

In Comprehensive Social Sciences and Comprehensive Physical Sciences, students in the compulsory and in the regular program were apparently graded on the basis of the same scores. In relation to the standard scores, no differences were found between grades received by students in the two groups. In Comprehensive logic, however, it was noted that students enrolled in the special sections of that course were graded on the basis of scores obviously different from those established for the students attending the regular sections.

Again using the Biometrical Computer Program - BMDP3B - a regression analysis was done for the 34 students enrolled in the regular sections of Comprehensive Logic and for the 55 students enrolled in the special sections of comprehensive logic. Grade received in Comprehensive Logic was the dependent variable and the following were the independent variables:

x_1 = age
 x_2 = high school g.p.a.
 x_3 = senior placement test score
 x_4 = standard score in CMC

The regression model had the form

$$\hat{y} = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + b_4x_4$$

where

b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 = regression coefficients of variables
 a, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4
 x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 = mean of variables 1,2,3, and 4
 y = intercept value
 \hat{y} = grade measured in CMC

A matrix of correlation coefficients for each group is shown respectively in Tables 15 and 16 and the results of the analyses for each group in Tables 17 and 18 respectively.

The mean grade received by the regular group in Comprehension logic was 2.13. Applying the above formula, the contributions each variable made to the mean grade was calculated from the data shown in Table 17 and was found to be as follows:

alpha	= -0.18
age	= .07
high school g.p.a.	= 2.14
senior placement test score	= 0.18
CMC standard score	= .45

Mean grade measured in CMC = 2.13

The mean grade received by the group assigned to the special section of Comprehension logic was 2.36. It was according for as follows:

Table 13 = Correlation coefficients (averaged) for four independent variables and grade-point average earned by 34 black students in the second meeting of Cooperative League.

Variable	<u><i>g</i></u>	<u><i>high school</i></u>	<u><i>high school</i></u>	<u><i>GP</i></u>	<u><i>GP</i></u>
age	.90	-.06	-.01	.32	.24
high school GPA:	.79	.16	.23	.34	.30
senior placement test score	.13	.10	1.00	-.30	.24
EGC standard score	.20	.00	-.23	1.00	.23
EGC grade	.18	.00	.24	.23	1.00

Table 14 = Matrix of correlation coefficients for four independent variables and grade-point average earned by 35 black students in the second meeting of Cooperative League.

Variable	<u><i>g</i></u>	<u><i>high school</i></u>	<u><i>high school</i></u>	<u><i>GP</i></u>	<u><i>GP</i></u>
age	1.00	-.49	-.19	.36	.23
high school GPA:	-.49	1.00	.18	.23	.22
senior placement test score	.18	.19	1.00	.26	.28
EGC standard score	.16	.19	.26	1.00	.22
EGC grade	.07	.27	.26	.22	1.00

Recurrents of the *Paracoccidioides* complex in Brazil: distribution, biology and medical importance. In: *Paracoccidioides brasiliensis* and human disease. Ed. by J. L. G. Gómez, R. L. Gómez and R. Gómez. Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Brasileira de Parasitologia, 1992, pp. 1-10.

Geographical area	Number of isolates	Number of isolates with known serological profile	Number of isolates with known geographical origin	Number of isolates with known serological profile and geographical origin	Number of isolates with known geographical origin and serological profile	Number of isolates with known geographical origin and serological profile and with known serological profile
Central Brazil	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192
North Brazil	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
South Brazil	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
South-east Brazil	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
North-east Brazil	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
Other areas	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125
Total	6,625	6,625	6,625	6,625	6,625	6,625

the isolates from the central region of Brazil, and 1,125 from the north, south, south-east and north-east regions. The isolates from the other areas were 1,125. The isolates with known geographical origin and serological profile were 1,125, and the isolates with known geographical origin, serological profile and with known serological profile were 1,125.

TABLE II - Mean, standard deviation, and range for 53 subjects in the 100% exercise group.

alpha	.66
vars	.159
high school g.p.a.	.48
senior placement test score	.28
GLC standard score	.30

Mean grade received in	
GLC	3.18

Correlations between the four independent variables and grades received in Comprehensive Logic are shown in Tables 18 and 19 for the groups enroled in the regular and special sections of Comprehensive Logic respectively.

Table 18 - Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) remaining when independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and grades received by 14 black students enrolled in the regular section of Comprehensive Logic

Variable Added	<i>r</i>	<i>R</i>
vars	.159	.159
high school g.p.a.	.483	.583
senior placement test score	.237	.318
GLC standard score	.309	.462

Table 19 - Correlations (r) and multiple correlations (R) remaining when independent variables are added to a regression model seeking the relationship between the variables and grades received by 35 black students enrolled in the special section of Comprehensive Logic

Variable Added	<i>r</i>	<i>R</i>
vars	.074	.074
high school g.p.a.	.273	.358
senior placement test score	.273	.487
GLC standard score	.323	.428

It may be noted from Tables 19 and 20 that the relationship between student scores and grades received in Comprehensive Logic are considerably greater for students enrolled in the special section of that course than it was for students enrolled in the regular sections. Therefore, grades attained is to some extent attributable to differences in grading practices and, thus, mean grade-point average earned by the two groups of black students does not constitute a common basis for comparing their academic performance.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This study inquired into the academic performance of 140 black freshmen admitted to the University of Florida for the 1970-71 academic year. Eighty-one of the students who did not meet the entrance requirements had been placed in a compensatory program designed to assist students whose educational, financial, social and cultural background may have limited their opportunities to pursue a course of higher education at the University of Florida.

One of the basic questions the study sought to answer was to what extent differences existed between black freshmen who had made satisfactory academic progress and black freshmen who had not done so. Indirectly, the study sought to evaluate the usefulness of the compensatory program. On the basis of the findings, the following conclusions were reached:

1. There were no significant differences between the group of black freshmen making satisfactory academic progress and the group of black freshmen making unsatisfactory academic progress.
2. Black students' achievement scores had the steepest relationship to grades earned by the black students.

- B. The usefulness of the Florida Welfare State Test as a basis for evaluating black students as either the compensatory or regular program at the University of Florida is questionable.
- C. The compensatory program provided an opportunity for 82 black students to gain admission to the University of Florida. The program did not discriminatory restrictions significantly on the academic performance of the black students.
- D. Students accepted to the compensatory program benefited, to some extent, from differential grading practices.
- E. The ability to cope with the then prevailing "separate ultimate" may have been one possible factor explaining a smaller homogeneous group of 141 black students than the group making satisfactory academic progress, the other making unsatisfactory academic progress.

On the average, the students making satisfactory academic progress could be distinguished from those making unsatisfactory academic progress by the following factors: They had earned a higher grade-point average in high school and had scored higher on the Florida Welfare State Test. They came from families with a higher average income and on which the occurrence of divorce or separation of parents was less frequent. A somewhat higher percentage of students in the group making satisfactory academic progress had graduated from integrated high schools.

The differences found, however, were minor. The results of the discriminant analysis showed that, for all practical purposes, the individuals in both groups came from the same population. No clear dichotomy could be established on the basis of the variables selected with the possible

exception of high school grade-point average. The various models used in the discriminant analysis to explore possible differences were significant at the .05 level only when high school grade-point average was included as one of the independent variables. Thus, however, none of the combinations of variables were useful in establishing significant differences between the two groups of black students.

Although high school grade-point average was the only independent variable which was significant in the discriminant model, its usefulness is questionable. The two groups differed by only .3 of a grade point. However, the range of high school grade-point average was wide for each group and highly overlapping so that on the basis of this variable alone, no definite conclusions can be drawn as to which of the two groups of students a black teacher is most likely to become. Thus, it may be concluded that differentiation between the group of black students making satisfactory academic progress and the group of black students making unsatisfactory academic progress cannot be established with the variables selected for this study. Both groups appeared to be similar in terms of high school achievement and family background.

The results of the discriminant analysis did bring into question the usefulness of the Florida teacher classification as a basis for assigning black teachers to unsatisfactory

or 1000) in the first year of residence, the students of the group numbered on this book by an average of just 10 points. Thus after three quarters, these same students were divided into two other groups—one making academic progress and one making non-satisfactory academic progress; the difference was found to be a mere 7 points. However, the results of the multiple regression analysis using scaled data showed the correlation between the first quarter grade point average and the University of Florida by the 100 black students to be only .12. In view of this weak relationship, it would seem that the practice of placing certain relatives on their lists as a means of selecting and managing black freshmen by either the sophomore or the regular programs is questionable.

None of the variables investigated yielded a high correlation to the pre-point average earned by the black freshmen. This may be noted from the results of the multiple regression analyses shown in tables 12, 13, and 14.

For the total group of 361 black students, high school grade-point average, with a correlation of .29, showed the highest although weak relationship to grade-point average earned at the University of Florida. A similar result was obtained in a separate regression analysis for the 55 students making unsatisfactory academic progress. In this group, the correlation between high school and college grade-point average was .34.

On the surface, it would appear that for the 10 students making satisfactory academic progress their relationship, with a correlation of -.881 was almost non-existent. Indeed, for this group of students, the total score on the Florida Twelfth Grade Test appeared to have the highest relationship (.294) to grade-point average earned at the University. The meaning of this, however, should be interpreted with caution. It may also be noted from Table 14 that for the students achieving satisfactorily, participation in the compensatory program showed a negative correlation of -.10 as compared to a value -.881 using pooled data and .143 for the students achieving unsatisfactory progress. Thus it would appear that in the more successful group, students from the regular program tended to earn the higher grades. It should be pointed out, however, that the students admitted to the regular program achieved, on the average, scores on the Florida Twelfth Grade Test of over 100 points higher than did the students admitted to the compensatory program. It would thus seem reasonable to believe that being admitted to the regular program and the Florida Twelfth Grade Test score would be highly correlated with each other and it is believed that this may be reflected in Table 14.

For the total group of 361 students, the relationship between Florida Twelfth Grade Test score and grade-point average earned at the University showed a correlation of only .13. This fact, coupled with the results of the

discriminant analyses, tend to indicate the suspicion that this test may not provide a useful basis for selecting and admitting black freshmen to the University of Florida.

The other variables investigated such as sex, integrated or non-integrated high school, family income, and parents' marital status showed either negative or very weak positive correlations. In the regression models, these variables added little to the multiple correlations with the possible exception of attendance at a non-integrated high school. This variable consistently showed a negative correlation in all three models (Tables 12, 13, and 14). In each case, however, the relationship was weak, to since that the students who graduated from all-black high schools tended to make the lowest grades would have to be dispelled with apprehension.

In 62 of the students in this study, the compensatory program provided an opportunity—one without which they would not have gained admission to the state's university system, and as is shown in Table 3, 63 percent of them were making satisfactory academic progress at the end of the 1973-1974 Quarter. But beyond providing that opportunity, it would appear from the results of the multiple regression analyses that the compensatory program did not directly contribute significantly to the academic achievement of the black students. Ironically, the highest positive relationship found between participation in the program and

standardized at the University was for the 55 students who were making compensatory progress. With a contribution of only .18, however, the usefulness of the program to the first category. For the 88 more successful students which survived 51 individuals from the compensatory program, the correlation was -.30, while for the total group, using pooled data, the correlation between participation in the compensatory program and level of academic achievement was found to be uniformly low obtaining a correlation of not quite -.15. Thus it would appear that the students assigned to the regular program tended to make the higher grades. Whatever the educational deficiencies of the less successful students, the compensatory program appeared to contribute little to overcoming those deficiencies. Some individual black students may well have benefited from the services provided in the compensatory program but to the total group, the contribution made by the program to the academic achievement of the students seems questionable.

The highest multiple correlation obtained, using all variables, was .48 which, although not unusual, would appear to be low. It was pointed out in the review of the Internals, an average multiple correlation of .65 has been obtained by various researchers using grades and standardized test scores to predict grades in college. Validity studies done by the College Entrance Examination Board for the University of Florida showed multiple correlations as high

in .81 using seven predictors including the Florida Aptitude Test and .77 using five predictors including the Florida Twelfth Grade Test. Thus with a multiple correlation of only .46, it would appear that factors in addition to those investigated were related to the academic performance of the black students.

It is, of course, difficult to reach definite conclusions in regard to the actual level of achievement attained by the students in the compensatory program because of the different grading positions held by on the Comprehensive Logic classes. The relationship between standard examinee scores and grades received in Comprehensive Logic showed a correlation of .39 for the regular students. For those in the compensatory program, the correlation was .31. There is no doubt that students in the compensatory program received higher grades than students in the regular program received for the same standardized test scores. To sum up, this affords the results of the discriminant analysis in that the two groups of black students were separated in the nature of grade-point average earned in the University of Florida. As it is, grades earned by individuals in the compensatory program reflect a level of academic achievement indicated by preferential grading positions.

The reason for this situation may have been to instill confidence and to motivate students to continue to progress.

the same institutions, the respiratory program's success, however, is still in doubt. The real effects, which already have been brought into question, require further research.

Nevertheless, the discriminant analysis established the fact that the 80 students taking satisfactory academic programs, and the 50 students not taking satisfactory academic programs, comprised a rather homogeneous group with respect to the variables studied. What really two seemingly similar groups of black students achieve at different levels in the proportion advanced here (not supported by the findings of this study) is that differences in levels of achievement may have been related to differences in ability to cope with the university's environment.

The students in this study come from families with an average annual income below \$1,000.00. Thirty-one percent of the students come from broken homes. Twenty-five percent had graduated from all black high schools. Of one hundred that many of these students had no plans to attend and begin until approached by the University of Florida, it was impossible to believe that this group of black students was far from "college-oriented." Furthermore, these 131 students comprised the first sizeable number of black students to be admitted to a traditionally all white university which, in 1970, had a campus climate that appeared to be far from "ideal" for black Americans. The presence of black

faculty and staff was almost nonexistent. As an open invitation to white culture, academic organizations on campus were receptive to black people. It would thus appear that in 1970, the "atmosphere" at the University of Florida was far from conducive to learning as far as the black students were concerned, many of whom had academic difficulties to begin with. That year, the university does not appear to have attracted many academically well-prepared black students who, according to the review of the literature, were in general seeking admission to well-known black colleges and universities.

In addition, preparatory education directed toward improving the educational deficiencies of black students was a rare experience on the campus of the University of Florida. During the three quarters covered by this study, the ensuing interaction between black students, the compensatory program, and the campus climate was, as pointed out in the review of the literature, unique with regard to this. This was a period during which faculty, administrators, and black students appeared to be searching to find a common ground for compatibility. For this particular group of black youngsters recruited in 1970, attending the University of Florida may well have been a difficult experience because of the many adjustments demanded from them and the University. It was this situation which leads to the assessment of the

proportion that one possible factor accounting for the separation of a rather heterogeneous group of 148 black students with the university making unsatisfactory academic progress, the other making unsatisfactory academic progress, was the difference in ability to cope with a difficult environment of education.

This study has brought into question the utility of the compensatory program as it is offered in 1970. Such, however, has changed as the campus of the University of Florida since that year. There are larger numbers of black students, faculty and staff. It appears the atmosphere has become more receptive to black students. If the compensatory program is maintained to fulfill the University's social obligations, further research should be conducted to learn if the program can be justified in terms of cost and effect in relation to expected results.

With its changed "attitude," however, it would appear the time has come for the University of Florida to exert greater effort in recruiting the many academically well-prepared black students who each year are graduating from high schools and community colleges. When "without permission" the University begins to attract these black students, then it may be offering educational opportunities that are truly equal.

Directions for Further Research

The findings of this study suggest the need for further research. Additional studies should be conducted to test the conclusion that the Expanded Educational Opportunities Program does not directly contribute significantly to the academic achievement of black freshmen at the University of Florida. If the conclusion is sustained, attention should be given to the question of whether resources, earmarked for the E. E. O. program, should be diverted to areas that do directly contribute in a significant way to the academic achievement of black students who do not meet admissions requirements. Decisions should not be reached, however, unless and until further research has been able to establish what those areas are.

An alternative would be to develop a university whose campus environment and academic offerings held the same appeal and promise for academically well-prepared black Americans as it currently does for white Americans. In this case, compensatory education practices should perhaps be left to those institutions which for many years have had a reputation of expertise in that area, e.g., the community colleges. In any case, the findings of the present study suggest the need for a reexamination of the part of the faculty and administration at the University of Florida as to what efforts and method most effectively assimilate black Americans into the academic setting of the university.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPANDED OPPORTUNITY OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

The program was designed to assist students whose financial, educational, social and cultural background may have limited their opportunities to pursue a course of higher education at the University of Florida. Each year, approximately 110 students are admitted, most of whom present scores on the Florida Test of High Grade Test below the required minimum for admission. A few are admitted with high school grades below the standards set for admission. Although the majority of the participants are Black Americans, the program is open to members of all races.

The students are enrolled in the regular required basic program, however, special sections are specifically designed by aid participants in the Expanded Educational Opportunity Program. The special sections are found in the following areas: Comprehensive English, Comprehensive Social Sciences, Comprehensive Physical Sciences, Comprehensive Logic, Mathematics.

Each student in the Program is assigned to an academic counselor at the time he first enrolls. The counselor advises the student concerning career options, scholarships, and academic problems which may arise. All effort is made

to prevent the students from experiencing extreme academic difficulty.

Classes are limited to between 15 and 20 students. During the initial quarter classes may meet five times a week instead of the usual three times a week. In the subsequent three quarters there is a gradual reduction of the classroom time.

To aid students in ensuring the regular academic progress of the individuality, special services are provided. Tutors are assigned to all students in the program for their required courses and for elective courses whenever possible. Counseling services are available in the form of academic, personal, and career counseling. Reading and study skills are improved through the University's Reading Improvement and Study Skills Center which is staffed with full-time personnel.

Financial aid is provided in the form of grants, loans, and workstudy programs. Participants are not allowed to work during the initial quarter (winter) and may work no more than two quarters of the total academic year.

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF THE FLORIDA STATEWIDE STANDARDS GRADE TESTING PROGRAM

The Statewide Testing Grade Testing Program is conducted in all Florida high schools each fall to provide comparable ability and achievement data on all students. The Testimony Instrument of the Florida program was prepared in 1961 by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

The six components of the test are as follows:

Academic Ability—verbal knowledge (based on synonymy, antonymy, part-whole, cause-effect, generalization, class-inclusion, and other relevant-antecedent relationships and situations in which there is insufficient data to determine type relationships)

English—usage (dialectic, idiom, parallelism, punctuation, logic and coherence, subject-verb agreement), sentence structure, punctuation, sentence meaning

General Knowledge—history, world history, some civics, literature, geography, ecology, general culture

Natural Science—biology, chemistry, physics, astronomy, ecology, meteorology

Mathematics—algebra, geometry, the number system, set theory, coordinate geometry, data interpretation

Reading—index based upon performance in verbal operational portion of ability test, the English test, and the social studies test.

Score isn't enough to earn a meritile rank based upon overall job placement. Instead, each student's performance is compared to that of other Florida high school seniors. The percentile rank indicates the percentage of students that earned scores equal to or less than a given raw score.

Scoring on the Florida Test of High Grade Test ranges from 0 to 480. Regulations of the Florida State Board of Regents require that a high school graduate possess a total of 360 or more for the sum of the percentile ranks on the five tests as well as "C" average in academic high school subjects to be fully eligible for admission to the state universities.

A score of 360 would place a person at the 50th percentile. The median score of the 1970 incoming freshman class at the University of Florida in 1970 was approximately 420 which is at the 95th percentile.

APPENDIX A

EXPLANATION OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

The following is based on Holland (1964):

A problem which often arises is that of discriminating between two groups of individuals on the basis of several properties of these individuals. Whenever a relationship exists between academic performance of a particular group of students and a set of variables, it is possible to estimate by means of multiple regression the academic performance a student may be expected to demonstrate, provided it can be ascertained that the student belongs to that class of students. To analyze the set of variables for the purpose of determining the group of students an individual is most like, the technique of discriminant analysis is an appropriate technique.

For example, we wish to classify a group of students, some of whom belong to one group (successful) and the rest to a second group (unsuccessful), into their proper group by means of a set of variables obtained from each student. If the two groups are similar with respect to the set of variables, it will not be possible to classify the students correctly by means of a single variable because of a fairly large amount of overlap in the distribution of this single

variable for two groups; however, it may be possible to find a linear combination of those variables whose distribution for the two groups would possess little overlap. This linear combination may then be used to yield a set of discriminant weights by which students of two groups could be differentiated. The procedure for discriminating would consist in finding a critical value of the index such that any student whose index fell below the critical value would be classified as belonging to the group, otherwise to the other group.

The principal difference between a linear discrimination function and an ordinary linear regression function arises from the nature of the dependent variable. A linear regression function uses values of the dependent variable to determine a linear function that will estimate the values of the dependent variable, whereas the discriminant function discriminates no such values but uses instead a profile of combined variables to discriminate between two groups of students on the basis of their combined profile (Most, 1968).

A linear combination of a set of variables may be represented as follows:

$$L = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \dots + a_nx_n$$

where x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are the variables and a the coefficient for each variable.

The problem then is to determine the b 's by means of some criterion that will enable it to serve as an index for differentiating between members of the two groups.

The discriminant function Z is in fact the weighted combination of the k variables that maximizes the difference between the groups.

Further explanation of this technique and examples of its practical application may be found in Tukey (1953), Tukey and Tukey (1954), Tukey (1961), Snedecor (1961), Tukey (1964), and Tukey (1966).

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

新規登録 [会員登録](#) [ログイン](#)

卷之三

Bank	First Group Values	Second Group Values	First Group Item No.	Second Group Item No.
1	0.03477		16	
2	0.03502		17	
3	0.03523		18	
4	0.03541		19	
5	0.03554		20	
6	0.03559		21	
7	0.03563		22	
8	0.03566		23	
9	0.03577		24	
10	0.03588		25	
11	0.03598		26	
12	0.03608		27	
13	0.03618		28	
14	0.03628		29	
15	0.03638		30	
16	0.03648		31	
17	0.03658		32	
18	0.03668		33	
19	0.03677		34	
20	0.03686		35	
21		0.03697		36
22		0.03708		37
23		0.03719		38
24		0.03731		39
25		0.03742		40
26		0.03753		41
27		0.03764		42
28		0.03775		43
29		0.03786		44
30		0.03797		45
31		0.03808		46
32		0.03819		47
33		0.03830		48
34		0.03841		49
35		0.03852		50
36		0.03863		51
37		0.03874		52
38		0.03885		53
39		0.03896		54
40		0.03907		55
41		0.03918		56
42		0.03929		57
43		0.03940		58
44		0.03951		59
45		0.03962		60
46		0.03973		61
47		0.03984		62
48		0.03995		63
49		0.04006		64
50		0.04017		65
51		0.04028		66
52		0.04039		67
53		0.04050		68
54		0.04061		69
55		0.04072		70
56		0.04083		71
57		0.04094		72
58		0.04105		73
59		0.04116		74
60		0.04127		75
61		0.04138		76
62		0.04149		77
63		0.04160		78
64		0.04171		79
65		0.04182		80
66		0.04193		81
67		0.04204		82
68		0.04215		83
69		0.04226		84
70		0.04237		85
71		0.04248		86
72		0.04259		87
73		0.04270		88
74		0.04281		89
75		0.04292		90
76		0.04303		91
77		0.04314		92
78		0.04325		93
79		0.04336		94
80		0.04347		95
81		0.04358		96
82		0.04369		97
83		0.04380		98
84		0.04391		99
85		0.04402		100
86		0.04413		101
87		0.04424		102
88		0.04435		103
89		0.04446		104
90		0.04457		105
91		0.04468		106
92		0.04479		107
93		0.04490		108
94		0.04501		109
95		0.04512		110
96		0.04523		111
97		0.04534		112
98		0.04545		113
99		0.04556		114
100		0.04567		115
101		0.04578		116
102		0.04589		117
103		0.04590		118
104		0.04601		119
105		0.04612		120
106		0.04623		121
107		0.04634		122
108		0.04645		123
109		0.04656		124
110		0.04667		125
111		0.04678		126
112		0.04689		127
113		0.04690		128
114		0.04701		129
115		0.04712		130
116		0.04723		131
117		0.04734		132
118		0.04745		133
119		0.04756		134
120		0.04767		135
121		0.04778		136
122		0.04789		137
123		0.04790		138
124		0.04801		139
125		0.04812		140
126		0.04823		141
127		0.04834		142
128		0.04845		143
129		0.04856		144
130		0.04867		145
131		0.04878		146
132		0.04889		147
133		0.04890		148
134		0.04901		149
135		0.04912		150
136		0.04923		151
137		0.04934		152
138		0.04945		153
139		0.04956		154
140		0.04967		155
141		0.04978		156
142		0.04989		157
143		0.04990		158
144		0.05001		159
145		0.05012		160
146		0.05023		161
147		0.05034		162
148		0.05045		163
149		0.05056		164
150		0.05067		165
151		0.05078		166
152		0.05089		167
153		0.05090		168
154		0.05101		169
155		0.05112		170
156		0.05123		171
157		0.05134		172
158		0.05145		173
159		0.05156		174
160		0.05167		175
161		0.05178		176
162		0.05189		177
163		0.05190		178
164		0.05201		179
165		0.05212		180
166		0.05223		181
167		0.05234		182
168		0.05245		183
169		0.05256		184
170		0.05267		185
171		0.05278		186
172		0.05289		187
173		0.05290		188
174		0.05301		189
175		0.05312		190
176		0.05323		191
177		0.05334		192
178		0.05345		193
179		0.05356		194
180		0.05367		195
181		0.05378		196
182		0.05389		197
183		0.05390		198
184		0.05401		199
185		0.05412		200
186		0.05423		201
187		0.05434		202
188		0.05445		203
189		0.05456		204
190		0.05467		205
191		0.05478		206
192		0.05489		207
193		0.05490		208
194		0.05501		209
195		0.05512		210
196		0.05523		211
197		0.05534		212
198		0.05545		213
199		0.05556		214
200		0.05567		215
201		0.05578		216
202		0.05589		217
203		0.05590		218
204		0.05601		219
205		0.05612		220
206		0.05623		221
207		0.05634		222
208		0.05645		223
209		0.05656		224
210		0.05667		225
211		0.05678		226
212		0.05689		227
213		0.05690		228
214		0.05701		229
215		0.05712		230
216		0.05723		231
217		0.05734		232
218		0.05745		233
219		0.05756		234
220		0.05767		235
221		0.05778		236
222		0.05789		237
223		0.05790		238
224		0.05801		239
225		0.05812		240
226		0.05823		241
227		0.05834		242
228		0.05845		243
229		0.05856		244
230		0.05867		245
231		0.05878		246
232		0.05889		247
233		0.05890		248
234		0.05901		249
235		0.05912		250
236		0.05923		251
237		0.05934		252
238		0.05945		253
239		0.05956		254
240		0.05967		255
241		0.05978		256
242		0.05989		257
243		0.05990		258
244		0.06001		259
245		0.06012		260
246		0.06023		261
247		0.06034		262
248		0.06045		263
249		0.06056		264
250		0.06067		265
251		0.06078		266
252		0.06089		267
253		0.06090		268
254		0.06101		269
255		0.06112		270
256		0.06123		271
257		0.06134		272
258		0.06145		273
259		0.06156		274
260		0.06167		275
261		0.06178		276
262		0.06189		277
263		0.06190		278
264		0.06201		279
265		0.06212		280
266		0.06223		281
267		0.06234		282
268		0.06245		283
269		0.06256		284
270		0.06267		285
271		0.06278		286
272		0.06289		287
273		0.06290		288
274		0.06301		289
275		0.06312		290
276		0.06323		291
277		0.06334		292
278		0.06345		293
279		0.06356		294
280		0.06367		295
281		0.06378		296
282		0.06389		297
283		0.06390		298
284		0.06401		299
285		0.06412		300
286		0.06423		301
287		0.06434		302
288		0.06445		303
289		0.06456		304
290		0.06467		305
291		0.06478		306
292		0.06489		307
293		0.06490		308
294		0.06501		309
295		0.06512		310
296		0.06523		311
297		0.06534		312
298		0.06545		313
299		0.06556		314
300		0.06567		315
301		0.06578		316
302		0.06589		317
303		0.06590		318
304		0.06601		319
305		0.06612		320
306		0.06623		321
307	</			

Rank	First Group Values	Second Group Values	Third Group Values	Fourth Group Values
18		0.02008		04
19	0.020588		09	
20		0.021000		03
21		0.02102		02
22		0.02103		01
23		0.02105		
24	0.021470		01	
25	0.021476		02	
26	0.021478		03	
27	0.021480	0.021429	01	01
28	0.021481		02	
29	0.021482		03	
30	0.021483		04	
31	0.021484	0.021439	01	01
32	0.021485		02	
33	0.021486		03	
34	0.021487	0.021481	01	01
35	0.021488		02	
36	0.021489		03	
37	0.021490	0.021487	01	01
38	0.021491		02	
39	0.021492		03	
40	0.021493		04	
41	0.021494	0.021438	01	01
42	0.021495		02	
43	0.021496		03	
44	0.021497		04	
45	0.021498	0.021486	01	01
46	0.021499		02	
47	0.021500		03	
48	0.021501		04	
49	0.021502	0.021485	01	01
50	0.021503		02	
51	0.021504		03	
52	0.021505		04	
53	0.021506	0.021484	01	01
54	0.021507		02	
55	0.021508		03	
56	0.021509		04	
57	0.021510	0.021483	01	01
58	0.021511		02	
59	0.021512		03	
60	0.021513		04	
61	0.021514	0.021482	01	01
62	0.021515		02	
63	0.021516		03	
64	0.021517		04	
65	0.021518	0.021481	01	01
66	0.021519		02	
67	0.021520		03	
68	0.021521		04	
69	0.021522	0.021480	01	01
70	0.021523		02	
71	0.021524		03	
72	0.021525		04	
73	0.021526	0.021479	01	01
74	0.021527		02	
75	0.021528		03	
76	0.021529		04	
77	0.021530	0.021478	01	01
78	0.021531		02	
79	0.021532		03	
80	0.021533		04	

Line No.	Spec. No.	Spec. No.	Spec. No.	Spec. No.
79		8.01323		18
80		8.01324		19
81		8.01325		20
82	8.01326			
83		8.01327		21
84	8.01328			
85		8.01329		22
86		8.01330		23
87	8.01331			
88		8.01332		24
89	8.01333			
90		8.01334		25
91		8.01335		26
92	8.01336			
93		8.01337		27
94		8.01338		28
95	8.01339			
96		8.01340		29
97		8.01341		30
98	8.01342			
99		8.01343		31
100		8.01344		32
101		8.01345		33
102		8.01346		34
103	8.01347			
104		8.01348		35
105		8.01349		36
106	8.01350			
107		8.01351		37
108		8.01352		38
109	8.01353			
110		8.01354		39
111		8.01355		40
112	8.01356			
113		8.01357		41
114		8.01358		42
115	8.01359			
116		8.01360		43
117		8.01361		44
118	8.01362			
119		8.01363		45
120		8.01364		46
121	8.01365			
122		8.01366		47
123		8.01367		48
124	8.01368			
125		8.01369		49
126		8.01370		50
127	8.01371			
128		8.01372		51
129		8.01373		52
130	8.01374			
131		8.01375		53
132		8.01376		54
133	8.01377			
134		8.01378		55
135		8.01379		56
136	8.01380			
137		8.01381		57
138		8.01382		58
139	8.01383			
140		8.01384		59
141		8.01385		60
142	8.01386			
143		8.01387		61
144		8.01388		62
145	8.01389			
146		8.01390		63
147		8.01391		64
148	8.01392			
149		8.01393		65
150		8.01394		66
151	8.01395			
152		8.01396		67
153		8.01397		68
154	8.01398			
155		8.01399		69
156		8.01400		70
157	8.01401			
158		8.01402		71
159		8.01403		72
160	8.01404			
161		8.01405		73
162		8.01406		74
163	8.01407			
164		8.01408		75
165		8.01409		76
166	8.01410			
167		8.01411		77
168		8.01412		78
169	8.01413			
170		8.01414		79
171		8.01415		80
172	8.01416			
173		8.01417		81
174		8.01418		82
175	8.01419			
176		8.01420		83
177		8.01421		84
178	8.01422			
179		8.01423		85
180		8.01424		86
181	8.01425			
182		8.01426		87
183		8.01427		88
184	8.01428			
185		8.01429		89
186		8.01430		90
187	8.01431			
188		8.01432		91
189		8.01433		92
190	8.01434			
191		8.01435		93
192		8.01436		94
193	8.01437			
194		8.01438		95
195		8.01439		96
196	8.01440			
197		8.01441		97
198		8.01442		98
199	8.01443			
200		8.01444		99
201		8.01445		100
202	8.01446			
203		8.01447		101
204		8.01448		102
205	8.01449			
206		8.01450		103
207		8.01451		104
208	8.01452			
209		8.01453		105
210		8.01454		106
211	8.01455			
212		8.01456		107
213		8.01457		108
214	8.01458			
215		8.01459		109
216		8.01460		110
217	8.01461			
218		8.01462		111
219		8.01463		112
220	8.01464			
221		8.01465		113
222		8.01466		114
223	8.01467			
224		8.01468		115
225		8.01469		116
226	8.01470			
227		8.01471		117
228		8.01472		118
229	8.01473			
230		8.01474		119
231		8.01475		120
232	8.01476			
233		8.01477		121
234		8.01478		122
235	8.01479			
236		8.01480		123
237		8.01481		124
238	8.01482			
239		8.01483		125
240		8.01484		126
241	8.01485			
242		8.01486		127
243		8.01487		128
244	8.01488			
245		8.01489		129
246		8.01490		130
247	8.01491			
248		8.01492		131
249		8.01493		132
250	8.01494			
251		8.01495		133
252		8.01496		134
253	8.01497			
254		8.01498		135
255		8.01499		136
256	8.01500			
257		8.01501		137
258		8.01502		138
259	8.01503			
260		8.01504		139
261		8.01505		140
262	8.01506			
263		8.01507		141
264		8.01508		142
265	8.01509			
266		8.01510		143
267		8.01511		144
268	8.01512			
269		8.01513		145
270		8.01514		146
271	8.01515			
272		8.01516		147
273		8.01517		148
274	8.01518			
275		8.01519		149
276		8.01520		150
277	8.01521			
278		8.01522		151
279		8.01523		152
280	8.01524			
281		8.01525		153
282		8.01526		154
283	8.01527			
284		8.01528		155
285		8.01529		156
286	8.01530			
287		8.01531		157
288		8.01532		158
289	8.01533			
290		8.01534		159
291		8.01535		160
292	8.01536			
293		8.01537		161
294		8.01538		162
295	8.01539			
296		8.01540		163
297		8.01541		164
298	8.01542			
299		8.01543		165
300		8.01544		166
301	8.01545			
302		8.01546		167
303		8.01547		168
304	8.01548			
305		8.01549		169
306		8.01550		170
307	8.01551			
308		8.01552		171
309		8.01553		172
310	8.01554			
311		8.01555		173
312		8.01556		174
313	8.01557			
314		8.01558		175
315		8.01559		176
316	8.01560			
317		8.01561		177
318		8.01562		178
319	8.01563			
320		8.01564		179
321		8.01565		180
322	8.01566			
323		8.01567		181
324		8.01568		182
325	8.01569			
326		8.01570		183
327		8.01571		184
328	8.01572			
329		8.01573		185
330		8.01574		186
331	8.01575			
332		8.01576		187
333		8.01577		188
334	8.01578			
335		8.01579		189
336		8.01580		190
337	8.01581			
338		8.01582		191
339		8.01583		192
340	8.01584			
341		8.01585		193
342		8.01586		194
343	8.01587			
344		8.01588		195
345		8.01589		196
346	8.01590			
347		8.01591		197
348		8.01592		198
349	8.01593			
350		8.01594		199
351		8.01595		200
352	8.01596			
353		8.01597		201
354		8.01598		202
355	8.01599			
356		8.01600		203
357		8.01601		204
358	8.01602			
359		8.01603		205
360		8.01604		206
361	8.01605			
362		8.01606		207
363		8.01607		208
364	8.01608			
365		8.01609		209
366		8.01610		210
367	8.01611			
368		8.01612		211
369		8.01613		212
370	8.01614			
371		8.01615		213
372		8.01616		214
373	8.01617			
374		8.01618		215
375		8.01619		216
376	8.01620			
377		8.01621		217
378		8.01622		218
379	8.01623			
380		8.01624		219
381		8.01625		220
382	8.01626			
383		8.01627		221
384		8.01628		222
385	8.01629			
386		8.01630		223
387		8.01631		224
388	8.01632			
389		8.01633		225
390		8.01634		226
391	8.01635			
392		8.01636		227
393		8.01637		228

Rank	First Group Values	Second Group Values	First Group Sum, Avg., ...	Second Group Sum, Avg., ...
125		0.001000		0
126		0.001000		0.0
127		0.001000		0.0
128		0.001000		0.0
129		0.001000		0.0
130		0.001000		0.0
131		0.001000		0.0
132		0.001000		0.0
133		0.001000		0.0
134		0.001000		0.0
135		0.001000		0.0
136	0.001000			0
137	0.001000		4.0	
138		0.001000		0.0
139		0.001000		0.0
140		0.001000		0.0
141		0.001000		0.0

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. C. "Regression, Discriminant Analysis, and a Standard Notation for Multivariate Statistics." In Cattell, R. B. (Ed.), Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Statistics. 1970.

Barger, R., and Hall, E. "The Interaction of Ability and Socioeconomic Variables in the Prediction of College Freshmen and Grade Achievement." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1949, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 397-404.

Burnett, Harry. "O'Connell's 'Loppel'—Rebuttal." Georgia Public Law, April 17, 1974, p. 4.

Burnett, Harry. "Reprints Back O'Connell's defense tables." Statesville Star, April 17, 1974, p. 7.

Burdette, L. F. Adrian High School - Negro. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964.

Byggm, L. "University Programs for Urban Black and Puerto Rican Women." Educational Record, 1968, Vol. 48, No. 4, pp. 342-354.

Elwood, R. G., and Peters, F. R. The Use of Academic Predictive Measures for Counseling and Selecting College Freshmen. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Hooper, J. W. "The Validity of American College Test for Assessing Potential Academic Achievement Levels—Ethnic and Sex Groups." The Journal of Educational Research, 1931, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 1-6.

Howard, J. "The Comparison of ODE Regression Equations for Regularly Admitted and Underprivileged Freshmen at the University of Illinois." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1930, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 219-226.

Hoover, L. R., and Hause, R. G. "Evaluation of Programs for Negroes." Educational Record, 1973, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 40-54.

Bureau of the Census. Regional and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States. Current Population Reports,

Bureau P-22, No. 28, Washington, D. C., Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, July, 1940.

Carney, W., and Patterson, A. Comparative Education Paper Series No. Six: Higher Education: A Preliminary Survey. New York: The Texas Center, Columbia University, 1939.

Chalk, C. "Council: A Survey by College for the Department Budget." COLLEGE BUDGET, 1939, Vol. 4, No. 9, pp. 13-15.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. "U. S. Survey of Undergraduate Requirements by State." Education, 82, p. April 13, 1940.

Clark, E. B., and Flotkin, L. The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges. New York: National Employment Service and Fund for Negro Business, 1943.

Clancy, T. A., and Fulton, T. L. "An Investigation of Dean Bias." Educational and Psychological Measurements, 1940, Vol. 10, pp. 73-78.

Clancy, T. A. "Race Bias—Familiarity of Classes of Negro and White Students in the Integrated Colleges." EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT, 1940, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 113-124.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E. Q., Nelson, C. J., and others. Review of Educational Opportunity. U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1940.

Commission on Higher Education Opportunity in the South. The Negro and Higher Education in the South. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1947.

Coppedge, F. L. "Selection of Selected Variables from High School Records to Computation of College Scores." The Journal of Educational Research, 1940, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 72-73.

Cronister, Chas. "The O'Connell Years." Galveston I. S., July 3, 1973, p. 88.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Crowley, F. J. "The Status of Negro High School Seniors." EDUCATIONAL AND COUNSELING JOURNAL, 1940, Vol. 37, No. 7, pp. 431-443.

Ward, J. L., and Samp, A. "Is the SAT Biased Against Black Students?" College Board Report, 1972, No. 31, pp. 4-10.

Ward, J. L. (Ed.), EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY PROGRAM, Davis, Calif., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Educational Publishers Association, Standards Applicable for Secondary School Textbooks, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Ward, J. L. "Some Implications for School Teachers of the Change Studies of Cultural Bias in Intelligence Tests," Secondary Educational Papers, 1963, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 281-291.

Ward, J. L. Higher Education for "High Risk" Students, Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1971.

Ward, J. L. Black Education and Black Americans, In Intergroup Communication and Equity for Negroes in the Higher Education Sector, Atlanta: Southern Education Reporting Service, May, 1969.

Ward, J. L. "Negro Academic Motivation and Performance: An Overview," Journal of Negro Education, 1968, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 3-12.

Whitman, J. A., Shantz, H., Rogers, G., and others, "Guidelines for Testing Mentally Gifted Children," Journal of Negro Education Supplement, 1964, No. 10, pp. 121-129.

Wright, W. W. "Relationships Among Various Measures of Socio-economic Status, Racial Class Identification, Race Bias, and School Achievement," Psychological Abstracts, 1958, Vol. 51, p. 2852.

Yost, G. "A Correlation Between the ACT Scores and the Grade Point Average of Freshmen at Indiana State College," College and University, 1949, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 124-126.

Zuckerman, D. L. "Correlations Between Secondary School Transcript Averages and Between ACT Scores and Grade-Point Averages of Freshmen at Indiana State College," College and University, 1947, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 82-86.

General References. "The Anxiety Thing," June 1, 1971, p. 42.

Garrett, R. P. "A Review and Interpretation of Seventy-Six Studies of Factors Related to Scholastic Success in Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Teachers Colleges," The Journal of Experimental Education, 1949, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 91-111.

Gordon, E. W., and Williamson, D. A. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1968.

Gordon, E. W. "Is Compensatory Education Working?" College Board Review, 1966-67, No. 43, pp. 3-11.

Gordon, E. W., and Tolleson, R. "Compensatory Education in the Equalization of Educational Opportunity." The Journal of Negro Education, 1967, Vol. 35, pp. 203-211.

Gordon, E. W. "Programs and Practices for Minority Group Youth in Higher Education." In Linkage to Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1972.

Holahan, D. L. "Promoting Black Student in Special Programs." Planning and Guidance Journal, 1971, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 28-32.

Hillen, J. R. "Predictions of College Studies for All Public Colleges of a State." Journal of Educational Research, 1944, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 119-120.

Hilbertz, T. Introduction to Research (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971.

Holl, F. C. Introduction to Mathematics Statistics (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Hollingshead, B. A. Who Should Be College. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.

Hosmer, D. C. "Factors in college recruitment." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 339-346.

Isenhardt, J. A. "The Use of Discriminant Analysis for Predicting Freshman Freshmen Students at the Midwestern University." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1971.

Jenkins, R. B. The Negro State College Student—An Analysis in Higher Education. Baltimore: Morgan State College Press, 1964.

Kallanayil, A. "The Prediction of Grades for Black and White Students at Michigan State University." Journal of Educational Management, 1973, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 207-213.

Kendall, R. A. "Social Class, Success and Cultural Bias," *College and Society*, 1947-48, No. 10, pp. 1-9.

Kendall, R. A. "The Social Representations of our Students," *College and Society*, 1947-48, No. 10.

Kendall, R. A., and others. "Traces from School in College," *Elementary Educational Research*, Washington: American Educational Research Association, Vol. 40, No. 2, February, 1970, pp. 151-179.

Kendall, R. A. "University Students on Campus." In KITTEL, R. A., and KITTEL, R. C. (Eds.), *The University Student as the Person: Representations and Possibilities*. Berlin, Germany: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1978.

Kohli, L. R., and Strobel, G. B. "Interrelationships Among Various Test-Scores, Achievement, and Social Class Success." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1959, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 217-229.

Kozin, D. B. *Individualization of Academic Performance. A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Research*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Lev, C. C. *Introduction to Educational Plastics*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Miner, R. A. "The Relative Standing of Peopie in High School, in Early College, and in College Education Institutions." *School and Society*, 1927, Vol. 5, No. 125, pp. 617-625.

Myrdal, J. B. "Some Implications of the Intellectual Characteristics of Persons Coming to Higher Education." *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 1945, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 145-165.

Parikh, B. B. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Reyes, J. M. "High School Effects on College Students," *Empirical Journal of Sociology*, 1970, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 39-51.

Robotham, J. W., Jr. "A Comparison of the Intellectual Representations of Cognitive Function for a High and Low Status Group." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1958, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 203-214.

Bernstein, J. L., and Bernstein, R. Assimilating Black-
parented Minority High School Students in Public Two-Year Col-
leges. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Educa-
tion, and Welfare, 1971.

Bunting, L. A. "Predicting College Grades in Predominantly
Negro Colleges." Journal of Negro Education, 1963, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 127-137.

Bunting, L. A. "Factors Influencing the Predictability of
College Grades." Journal of Negro Education Research, 1970, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 91-107.

Bureau, F. Report on Higher Education. U.S. Dept. of
Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.:
Government Printing Office, 1971.

Brown, R. "Measurement and Admissions of Minority Students
For Quality Analysis." In Altman, R. L., and Snyder,
P. G. (Eds.), The Minority Student in College: Description
and Prospects. Boulder, Colorado: Center for
Research and Development in Higher Education, University
of California, Berkeley and Western Interstate Com-
mission for Higher Education, 1970.

Calley, G. R. "Five College Comparisons." College Entrance
Examination Board Bulletin, 1960, No. 45, pp. 74-81.

Calley, G. R., and Starn, R. W. "An Approach to the Measure-
ment of Psychological Characteristics of College Admis-
sionees." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, No. 49,
pp. 269-277.

Fluehr, R. H., and Reddick, W. W. "The Validity of Academic
Predictors for Black and White Students at a Predomi-
nantly White University." Journal of Educational
Psychology, 1973, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 253-261.

Reddick, W. W. "Violence at US Quaker, Black State Schools,"
Salisbury, May, April 26, 1971, p. 1.

Reddick, W. W. "Rapkin Group Held Off Investigation,"
Salisbury, June 11, 1971, p. 1.

Richter, J. H., and Rose, R. W. "Predicting Student Accom-
plishment in College From the ACT Assessment." Journal
of Educational Psychology, 1968, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp.
27-31.

Rosin, R. C. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychological
Perspective of Social Stratification," American Psychol-
ological Review, 1954, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 203-231.

Colquitt, B. D., and Sorenson, W. R. "The Academic Success of Black Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 249-257.

Conrad, R. C. "Males Are More Predictable Than Females." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1943, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 273-278.

Coughlin, D. Predicting College Success as Evidence. Washington, D.C.: BUREAU OF EDUCATION, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bulletin No. 18, 1934.

Edwards, H. D. Survey and Analysis of Higher Education Programs for the Disadvantaged Student. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Stanley, J. C. "Further Evidence via the Analysis of Variance that Males Are More Predictable Than Females." Journal of Educational Research, 1947, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 117-121.

Stanley, J. C. "Predicting College Success of the Disadvantaged Disadvantaged." College, 1931, Vol. 32, pp. 446-457.

Stanley, J. C., and Poston, A. C. "Correlation of Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores with College Grades for Negro Female Freshmen." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1947, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 279-289.

Stearns, George G. "Environment for Learning." In Standard Deviations (Ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1952., 1957.

Stevens, R. M., and Stevens, R. V. "Discriminant analysis." Review of Educational Research, 1954, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 403-477.

Teng, Q. "Validity of the SAT for Black and White in Chinese Interpreted Institutions." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 295-301.

Thomas, C. L., and Stanley, J. C. "Predictiveness of High School Grades for Predicting College Grades of Black Students: A Review and Discussion." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1969, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 291-313.

Thurstone, L. L. College Admissions and the Public Interest. New York: Goodwin Educational Foundation, 1946.

Turbovitz, J. S., "The Effect of the Achievement Function in Psychological and Guidance Investigations," Harvard Educational Review, 1951, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 31-39.

Turbovitz, J. S. W., "Significant Research in the Prediction of Academic Success," In Cobain, M. T., (ed.), Current Trends in Research in Guidance and Development, The McGraw-Hill Company of New York, 1949.

Whitbeck, W. R., "Many of the 'lowest third' of our grade-
sons are College Material," College Board, 1928,
Vol. 12, pp. 344-346.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 241, "Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October 1931," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1932.

Northwestern, L. R., and Gray, C. H., "Factors of Academic Success: A Multivariate Analysis," The Journal of Educational Research, 1973, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 7-22.

EDWARD VAN GELDER

Edward Van Gelder is a native of Rotterdam, The Netherlands, where he attended public schools. Before coming to the United States at the age of 21, he was employed as an assistant buyer by an International manufacturer and trading company.

In the United States, after employment with a Chicago department store and two years of service with the U.S. Army, he earned the B.S. degree in Business Administration from the University of Tampa in 1950. While serving that University as its Director of Admissions, he received the A.A. degree from Teachers College—Columbia University in 1954.

In 1955, he became the Director of Student Admissions at the University of Florida. He attended the Graduate School of that University until December, 1959, when he was awarded the B.B. degree in Educational Administration. College Level II with a major in ministry.

Edward Van Gelder is married to the former Betty Louann Schaefer of Tampa, Florida. They have three children.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Charles H. Haskins, Ph.D.
Professor of History

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


John M. Neibauer
John M. Neibauer, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of History

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


George W. Cole, Ph.D.
Professor in Educational
Administration and Dean of Academic
Affairs for Institutional Services

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


George W. Cole, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of History

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Joseph T. Flanagan
Professor of Sociology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


William R. McCallum
Professor of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December, 1973


B. L. Shantz
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School